BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

THE

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW

BC

Under the Direction of

MOST REV. EDMOND F. PRENDERGAST, D. D.

RIGHT REV. MGR. JAMES P. TURNER, D. D., ASSOCIATE EDITOR,

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXXIX.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1914.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA:
610 SOUTH WASHINGTON SQUARE.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXIX.—JULY, 1914—No. 155

PIUS THE TENTH.

AN "ECCLESIASTICAL" POPE.

"I have loved, O Lord, the beauty of Thy house, and the place where Thy glory dwelleth."—Psalms xxv., 8.

NOT as the factitious caption for an article, but as the simple record of a personal fact, the word "ecclesiastical" has been placed here as the crystallized expression of the specific character and activity of the great and holy Pope just dead. For it is now many years since this term first suggested itself to the present writer, and was used by him on casual occasions, as one that briefly yet sufficiently told of the special bent of mind and heart that marked Pius the Tenth. And the years that have passed since then, as we scarcely need say, have only served to deepen this original impression and thus render the word more fully justifiable. As a slight explanation of what is meant here, it may be observed that in its present technical sense—the sense the writer had in mind—the expression means "A Pope of the Church," "ecclesia" meaning the congregation of all the faithful under one head. And finally, the term was taken to mean in particular the interior life of the Church, as distinguished from the vast diplomatic and other external relations which form an integral and indispensable part of its universal organic life, and which have been so fully illustrated by the high statesman-like abilities of many other Popes.

Six years in Italy and a subsequent protracted visit to France and Rome, including repeated occasions of seeing Pope Leo and a personal interview with Pius the Tenth, as well as a term of official activity in the Apostolic Delegation at Washington during

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1913, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

the latter's pontificate, an experience necessarily bearing with it an intimate knowledge of all the Pope's actions towards the Church at large, and especially with regard to the Church in America, may be mentioned as the material bases for the lingering reminiscent thoughts and convictions now recorded here.

We have indicated that Pope Pius the Tenth had his face turned to the Church and away from diplomacy, but by this we by no means mean to affirm any lack of ability in this important direction. We only assert an inherent tendency and almost instinctive feeling by which he seemed impelled, almost exclusively, to the interior beauty of the house of God; statecraft and its allied activities being to him an unwelcome interruption and distraction interfering with this task of native predilection. Nor need we say that his times were especially favorable for the indulgence of this bent. Leo's commanding diplomatic ability, united with Rampolla's scarcely inferior power, had already drawn the full toll of all that the courts of Europe were willing to grant to the Church in his times; and thus the task of Pius was largely restricted to the steady sustaining of the direful shocks which even those exalted talents had not availed to avert, while whatever of other international entanglements actually arose were met with decision and success.

And France herself aided Pius most signally, even if most unwillingly, in the close prosecution of his chosen work; for the consequences of the vaunted "Law of Separation" in the land of its origin were such as to bring to an indefinite pause the similar programmes of Spain and Italy. The Church in France gained instead of losing by that enactment, and the other Powers, looking on, became, if anything, more mild and more conciliatory, turning their attention rather to material expansion and to the martial preparation needed to sustain it than to any religious issues, thus leaving the gentle pastor to his own favorite work, the daily and hourly care of his own beloved flock.

And in all we can see clearly visible the hand of that God Who ever watches over His Church with unfailing Providence. For His especial care in this regard can be plainly seen in the wide, receding perspective, easily discernible now that its really distinguishing features stand out in high relief from the confusing maze into which their granitic fibres were so slowly and so painfully woven. In Pius the Tenth God gave to His Church the pastor it needed most when he was needed most for its deepest inner care; and the same God sustained him throughout all his arduous years.

Nothing could be more erroneous than the belief that the pontificate of Pius was one of comparative ease. It was only a change of difficulty, not its elimination. And the mind can soon appreciate

this, if it will but make the survey of the philosophical and theological field invested during this Pontiff's time and mark the foes that threatened the Church he so loved, and that actually wrought great evil within it, despite his eager and ever vigilant care. It is well that one so zealous stood on guard against enemies who sought not so much to deprive the Church of her useful civil allies as to extinguish her very life by robbing Christ of His divinity, its infinite wisdom and by destroying the warmth of affection and fidelity due to that other Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom Christ had sent, its infinite love.

I. MODERNISM.

Such were the capital crimes of Modernism, the especial hydra of heresy in Pope Pius' time; such the unworthy foes that harassed him. Very much indeed after the manner of Encyclopædists of more than one hundred years ago—for history repeats itself in these things, too, and each age brings its own self-appointed universal dictators—the Modernists assumed to themselves a universal mission of reformation in theology and philosophy, or rather in the negation of both, in so far as any real sense of these words is concerned. Denial in general, or at most the affirmation of material entities in an empirical way, was the general aspect of the older movement, just as it is a leading feature of Modernism. For the Encyclopædists in general God was considered a subject unworthy of any real consideration, and the Modernist doctrine would likewise degrade Him to a merely material figment of sense organs in man. Both systems wished to break with the past, and therefore both hated the Church, the one effectually conservative body in the entire world. But Modernism is even more distinctively destructive than the Encyclopædic system, for Modernism definitely attacks religious issues, while the Encyclopædists were content to remain more general, at least in their openly professed aims.

And in its own name, and like all other heresies of all other times, this self-inflated system called Modernism knew well that Christ must ever be the central point of any attack that seeks to destroy the Church; and just as the Popes of all other ages have been under God the one hope of that Church, so this modern multiplex error found an invincible obstacle in him who at the very outset had said that his aim would be to restore all things precisely in that Christ Whom Modernism fain would rob of His eternal crown of absolute, undoubted divinity. Those who wish may examine this error more fully in places where this more rightly belongs; but it may be well even here to outline its features in order to see what Pope Pius conquered and how the signal victory was won. For

without this the just closed pontificate would lack its most essentially distinguishing mark.

Pius commenced his reign in 1903 and Modernism raised its accursed head from its native slime of ignorance and pride about the years 1905 and 1906, although, as is shown in the case of Loisy, its principles had already made great progress in France before that time. And first of all, we may briefly remark that in order to hide its really and fatally subversive character, Modernism, like one of its remoter philosophical bases, Pragmatism, makes the claim—energetically denied by Pope Pius—that it is rather a general mental attitude and viewpoint than any orderly series of definite assertions. The real truth, as pointed out by the Pope, is that it becomes only too deplorably definite in a multitude of most injurious ways. It is true that in the beginning it resuscitates a kind of Cartesian doubt and universal skepticism as the only due point of departure for any complete scientific investigation of the bases and powers of human reason. And it must be noted secondly that, according to the Modernists, supernatural truth is not exempted from this factitious criterion, but must be subjected to it just as fully as the ordinary data of natural reason; from which two principles there follows the undoubted third illation that Modernism thus sets itself up as a kind of universal tribunal invested with an absolutely supreme and plenary right of examination and judgment concerning all things, both temporal and eternal, both human and divine; conceding or denying existence and knowability and verity, now to one and now to another, of real or supposed truths, without being subject to any appeal from its own wholly irresponsible and irrevocable caprice. And lastly, as the general result of this professedly agnostic orientation and personally supreme methods of investigation, we are not surprised to find man himself emerge as the real creator of all reality and of all truth; as a being, therefore, who can indulge all his vagaries of mind and all his tendencies of body without any fear of a final accounting. For it is clear that in the views of Modernism, subjectivism is supreme and all permanent objective reality is destroyed. It is by no means the intention of Modernism that all this should appear right on the surface of their system, nor does it; but the fact remains that any adequate analysis of its most basic principles can lead to no other conclusion.

But if, on the one hand, Modernism thus wished to disguise its real form, on the other it knew that the effective force of any tenet, whether true or false, is in an inverse proportion to its vagueness and indistinct character. And thus, since the system had practical aims, it soon attempted to become more powerful by becoming more specific in its teachings. And, as will appear more fully for

those who have opportunity for lengthy examination, with the swift, unerring accuracy attending the aims of all heresies, Modernism first of all, as has been said, sought out Christ as the principal object of its fatally destructive efficiency. Just here we can only quote it slightly to this effect; but this will be sufficient, since even the few words we shall take will be seen to show conclusively that Modernism would really mean the destruction of all proper belief in Christ. "Christ," it says, "did not always have the consciousness of His Messianic dignity" (Decree "Lamentabili"), at which all must at once ask what kind of a God that would be Who did not know His own nature or office? But Modernism still proceeds to say further that "the divinity of Christ is not proved by the Gospels, but is a dogma which Christian consciousness deduced from the idea of the Messiah" (Ibid), and we are also told that "in all the Gospel texts the name 'Son of God' is equal only to the name 'Messiah' and by no means signifies that Christ is the true and natural Son of God" (Ibid).

And Modernism thus seeks to destroy Christ, precisely because it and every other heresy has always known that He is indeed and exclusively "the way and the truth and the life" (John xiv., 6), and that therefore any departure from Him must mean doctrinal wanderings, error and death. As we have noted, the propositions quoted above are taken from the Decree "Lamentabili" of July 3, 1907 (Acta S. Sed., 1907, p. 470), in which the Holy Office under the direction of Pius the Tenth gives a list of sixty-five propositions formed from Modernistic works and including their principal definite errors. We can easily judge the effect of blasphemies such as these upon the great Pope whose heart was centred on that same Christ with most especial predilection—so much so that his entire aim, as professed solemnly by himself at the very beginning of his reign, was no other than that of "restoring all things in Christ."

And we make the note here that we shall be guided in our view of Modernism mainly by the Encyclical letter "Pascendi" of December 8, 1907, and this Decree "Lamentabili" of July 3, 1907; and we shall do this both as the discharge of a pleasing filial duty and for the sake of exactest scientific accuracy, the minds behind these documents being easily supreme in this matter, both on account of native ability and because of the most commanding acquired attainments. Without any doubt the Modernists, after the manner of all of their kind, will complain of misrepresentation. But the famous discussion concerning "dogmatic facts" and its definitive outcome is a sufficient answer to any claims of this kind, and the implicit challenge against any such charge of misrepresentation placed by Pope Pius, "lest we should be reprehended as not knowing their

tenets" (Acta S. Sedis, 1907, p. 632), removes the least danger of any inaccuracy in this masterly exposition of Modernistic principles and conclusions. Even secular journals by no means Catholic in their leanings have given this document "Pascendi" the highest praise on merely scientific grounds. "The Encyclical 'Pascendi Dominici gregis' has acquired a great and just celebrity" . . . "It is acknowledged by all to be a very remarkable piece of philosophical criticism." "In addition to the fact that the ideas whose condemnation it promulgates are set forth with great clearness and precision, they are assembled and grouped together with vigorous and penetrating thought" (Larousse Mensuel, Paris, November, 1907). And we note at once that, in order to avoid needless repetitions, our citations, unless otherwise specified, will refer to the two documents named—"Pascendi" and "Lamentabili."

But we must go back some distance if we wish to know the really supreme theological and philosophical importance of the struggles that Pius the Tenth had to maintain throughout the whole course of his long pontificate. And this wish seems legitimate here, since the mere facts of election, coronation and decease are of very slight permanent interest in the life of any Pope, and are easily accessible whenever desired. The kind and extent of His contests and victories for his God and his Church—these are features that leave traces in time and in eternity of every Pope, and these are the themes that should engage us most. Napoleon and Cæsar are best known by their wars, and Pius can best be studied by the enemies he met and opposed. Positive enactments of his own free will must also be noted and weighed, but the life of man on earth is a warfare, and this is especially true of the Popes, since they must ever be the leaders in denying the irregular desires of sin-corrupted human natures.

And even the slightest search for the real sources of what is called "Modernism" will at once suggest a previous notorious error, will at once uncover a deep pragmatistic taint; and we must note this here, since even the chronological order betrays and suggest what logic perceives in this deplorable union of erratic extremes, and all history shows, moreover, that philosophical errors have ever preceded aberrations in faith.

Just about a quarter of a century before Modernism took definite form and name Pragmatism had already found its first beginnings with Pierce, and up to and beyond the appearance of Modernism it was most assiduously cultivated, and in cultivating deeply changed, by James in the United States, by Schiller in England, by Le Roy—and in a quasi-manner by Bergson—in France, and—with much greater brilliancy than by any of the rest—by Papini in Italy,

this last a fact of most sinister signification, since it was in Italy, too, that Modernism first seems to have taken deep and lasting root. And in this baleful system called Pragmatism we can clearly see the undoubted germs of its later growth and development in Modernism; for—as one indication, the title chosen by Bergson—he was a furnisher of principles for the Pragmatists rather than an elaborator of their conclusions, shows the really ultimate character of both systems. That title was "L'Evolution Créatrice ("Creative Evolution"), an evolution really essential in Modernism and an evolution which in Pragmatism did not use any veiled terms or any merely implicit derivations, but openly, and explicitly, and professedly made man the real creator of all reality and all truth; and this is precisely the germ of the entire positive side of Modernism. In this vast system of combined heresies called Modernism, therefore, Pius had to combat errors long and carefully prepared for and deeply elaborated—errors, therefore, all the more difficult to deal with and to eradicate.

We have indicated that Modernism is, on its negative side, rather a mental standpoint and tendency than a body of connected assertions; and this is true, because it was true of Pragmatism, from which so many of Modernism's ideas are borrowed. The history of one under this aspect will, therefore, be also that of the other. And—likewise as already observed—this tendency is something of a Cartesian skepticism, with additions much more sweeping and much more destructive of science than anything that typical doubter ever had planned. First of all, Modernism denies all orderly coöperation between sense and intellect, divides one completely from the other, and then throws all intellectual activity aside as something ridiculously antiquated and effete. Speaking of Natural Theology, the Motives of Credibility and of External Revelation, Pope Pius says, "Modernists set these completely aside and relegate them to intellectualism"—a system, they say, to be ridiculed and one long since defunct. If we place at the side of this some words of Professor James, each mind can draw its own conclusions regarding the common orientation of Modernism and Pragmatism. "I saw," he says, "that philosophy had been on a false scent ever since the days of Socrates and Plato; that an intellectual answer to the intellectualist's difficulties will never come, and that the real way out of them, far from that consisting in the discovery of such an answer, consists in simply closing one's ears to the question" . . . "I had literally come to the end of my conceptual stock in trade; I was bankrupt intellectually and had to change my base." ("A Plural Univ., ed. 1909, pp. 291-292.) From such words as these it is clear that the words of the Pope concernig anti-intellectualists are

by no means overdrawn; and we may also remark incidentally that these passages form a fair sample of that unlimited pride which the same Pontiff places as the principal moral cause of the vagaries of Modernism. But Professor James has yet other passages which it will doubtless be well to place here, since—unlike the methods of his imitators amongst the Modernists—they have at least the merit of frankness, and thus let us know the real mind of the cult. "Intellectualism," he says, "in the vicious sense began when Socrates and Plato taught that what a thing really is, is told us by the definition." "Ever since Socrates we have been taught that reality consists of essences, and not of appearances" ("Plural Univ.," p. 218). "In principle, then, as I said, intellectualism's edge is broken; it can only approximate reality, and its logic is inapplicable to our inner life, which spurns its vetoes and mocks at its impossibilities" ("Plural," 289.) "For my own part, I have finally found myself compelled to give up the logic"—James is typically vague in his terms, but he here means intellectuality in general—"I have finally found myself compelled to give up the logic, fairly, squarely and irrevocably." Again, he speaks of what "has led me personally to renounce the intellectualistic method and the current notion that logic (sic) is an adequate measure of what can or cannot be" ("A Plural Universe," p. 225. Ed. 1909).

With the intellect thus rejected and dismissed in disrepute, both Pragmatism and Modernism do the only thing that either could do, and that is to restrict, under one formula or another, all really knowable entities to the realm of sense. Pragmatism loves a reality that is ever on the flow; and the flow is from sense, not to it. Its favorite idea is that which makes our own ever succeeding activity the real creator of all reality. Modernism, more veiled in profession, though not in truth, revolts and recedes a little in the beginning from the open avowals of man-creative Pragmatism, but only to assert them even more fully in its final definitions. For Modernism, as a quasi-religious system, is content in its exordium with saying that all our real and historic knowledge is restricted within the realms of phenomena. "By reason of this," says Pope Pius, reporting the Modernists, "human reason is wholly restricted to phenomena, to things, that is, which are visible, and in that form in which they are visible, and it has neither the right nor the power to pass beyond their limits." We have already heard James give as an instance of "vicious" intellectuality the teaching that reality did not consist in appearances (Plural, 218). No philosopher of the school he thus attacks ever said that appearances were not real appearances, and what James is here clumsily trying to deny is, therefore, the essences, the permanent realities from which the pass-

ing reality of appearances flow. And thus here again the parallel is perfect, and Modernism has followed its agnostic teacher, Pragmatism.

Restricted thus to appearances and to sense, it is not wonderful that both Pragmatism and Modernism should have a cognate list of knowable and unknowable things; and, as a matter of fact, both remand God, first of all, and then all spiritual things, to the dark void of an unknown that lies wholly beyond our view. It is true that in a vain sense both make efforts to call God and immaterial things back again to a kind of misty realism; in a form, that is, in which they cannot injure or assail man's supreme egotism; but even this forced attenuation is at the violent cost of all their consistency, and in fact is but a false pretense intended to commend their systems to a world by no means ready to plunge itself at their command into hopeless, universal skepticism. By a rude inversion of the term, James deigns to admit that logic "has an imperishable use in human life," but it takes care to observe very emphatically that that use is not to make us theoretically acquainted with the essential nature of reality. He only and vaguely promises to tell us what that "imperishable use," apart from the scientific attainment of truth, really is. "Just what it is I can perhaps suggest to you a little later." We, too, shall relate later on what he here means. Just now we are concerned only with his negation of real knowability in the things that do not appear to sense.

And strictly on a line with this general idea of Pragmatism—and for the same reason—is the Modernist tenet recorded by Pius: "Wherefore it (human reason) can neither raise itself to God nor know of His existence in any way from visible things." From which it is inferred that God can in nowise be a direct object of knowledge; and as regards history, God is by no means to be considered as a subject of history. What, moreover, is thus said here is equally applicable, as the Pope points out, to "whatever is divine" to the person of Christ, to the mysteries of His life and death, to His resurrection and ascension into heaven. And so much at present for the negative parallel between Modernism and Pragmatism.

As to their positive side, the relations of Pragmatism and Modernism are equally close. "What is called the positive part," says Pope Pius, speaking of Modernism, "consists in 'vital immanence;'" and he explains the position and the meaning of this term in the Modernistic system by showing that Modernists grant religion as a fact, and therefore see the need of some explanation of this fact No exterior explanation being possible, they seek this explanation in man himself; and, since religion is a form of life, they seek it in the life of man. And thus from life we have "vital" and from its

interior aspect we have "immanence," which two, being compounded, give this favorite high-sounding but unfortunately vapid term, "vital immanence." But since, further, and still in the Modernistic sense, every effect must have a cause, the Modernists ask themselves why this fact of religion appears at all; and they answer that it is due to a "need" in man for religion; and then when they ask whence this need, they place their last foundation in subconsciousness, as occasionally revealed by the activity of a non-cognitive, material organ in a movement of the heart. And they are thus forced to a mere organ of sense, and they call this movement a sense—it is also their "faith"—a "religious" sense, precisely because, like Pragmatism, they have explicitly and professedly turned away from all "intellectualism" as from something intolerably useless and absurd. For, as we have said, what moves this "sense" into action is a certain intrinsic "need," and this need is hidden originally in the mysterious realms of "subconsciousness," making itself felt only when the person has placed himself in circumstances proper for its manifestation.

And just here it seems well to make a reflection; for this eternal blending of contradictory terms and sections of terms should be called to a strict account. This prefix "sub" either means something or it does not. If not, then the whole fabric of Modernism falls. If it does mean something, the only thing it can mean is "under," "below," "beyond," "because," "below;" and whatever is thus wholly beyond the realm of real consciousness—and for Modernism this "need" must be of this nature—cannot be affirmed by Modernism or anything else, except through a distinct external revelation, something again which Modernism wholly denies. And thus again the whole fabric of Modernism, based as it is on this absurd "subconsciousness," falls to logical ruin.

Under the stimulus, however, of these supposed circumstances and of this supposed "need" the heart moves, and this thus active sense now finds in itself the divine reality, and finds it there both as its own object and as its own intimate cause, and thus in a manner joins man to God. All these are very important points in any study of Modernism; but the main point, nevertheless, to be noted for the present comparison with Pragmatism is the wholly "intra-hominem" character thus given to religion, even in its ultimate and only object, origin and cause. For what Modernism thus says of religion that Pragmatism teaches concerning all things, and thus again merits at least the praise of directness. In the belief of both these systems, whatever is not in man himself or in the visible world around him must remain forever unknown, even granting that anything outside of these could exist. And for Modernism

God cannot logically thus be allowed to exist independent of man; for "shall we not," says the Pope, although more confusedly, "call that religious sense appearing in consciousness God Himself manifesting Himself to the soul in that same religious 'sense?'" And thus even God Himself is for the Modernists a creation of their own, in which creation they then proceed, as a matter of course, to include all the things that are of God, including with especial force and purpose the whole magisterium and ministerium of the Church, with all their dogmatic, sacramental and disciplinary activities.

And surely in seeking some probable source whence so-called Catholic men could even think of believing such doctrines, we are at least struck by Bergson's "Evolution Créatrice" (Larousse, 1907, No. 8), already mentioned, and by the similar formulæ of Papini and his fellow-Pragmatists—formulæ which were just standing out in their first tinsel novelty when Modernism's real beginnings were first taking form, as is evidenced by Pope Leo's contemporary warning Encyclical on Scriptural studies. "Because of his intelligence," Bergson is credibly quoted as writing, "man has created matter, or rather intelligence and matter have a common origin." "It is from the depths of consciousness," we are told, "from the 'vital action' which is at the root even of being, that we must commence in order to conceive the evolution of nature and of intelligence," where every one must be struck by the close parallel with Modernism's "vital immanence." "I myself believe," says James in a similar strain, "that the evidence for God lies primarily in inner personal experiences" (Prag., 109), an almost verbatim rendition of the "vital immanence" of the copying Modernists. What that "God" of James must mean will soon appear. It is true that Bergson goes deeper than the Modernists; but after Bergson's scale of being has risen to man, the Modernists join him and make man the creator, not of mere matter, but of God Himself and of all divine things.

As for open, professed Pragmatism, James unhesitatingly says, "It (a cognate suggestion of Lotze) is identically our pragmatistic conception." "In our cognitive as well as in our active life we are creative." "We add both to the subject and to the predicate part of reality." The world stands really malleable waiting to receive its final touches at our hands." "Like the kingdom of heaven, it suffers human violence willingly. Man *engenders* (the italics are James') truth upon it." "No one," he continues, "can deny that such a rôle would add both to our dignity and to our responsibility as thinkers," precisely the proud pretention of Modernism (Prag., 256-7). And the same James says that his leader and teacher, Papini, "grows fairly dithyrambic over the views that it opens of man's divinely creative functions" (Ibid, p. 257). How this happy

state may be attained is graphically, even if not very intelligibly, told by James himself à la Bergson. "Place yourself at a bound or *d'emblée,* as M. Bergson says, inside the living, moving, active thickness of the real, and all the abstractions and distinctions are given into your hand; you can now make the intellectualist substitutions to your heart's content" ("Plural Univ.," 261). Qui potest capere, capiat). And in still aother place he gives results: "The import of the difference between Pragmatism and rationalism (still another of James' vague designations for "intellectualism") is now in sight throughout its whole extent." "The essential contrast is that for rationalism reality is ready-made and complete from all eternity, while for Pragmatism it is still in the making and awaits part of its complexion from the future" ("Prag.," 257), words which receive their full signification only when they are understood, as James and Pragmatism understand them, to include the making of God and religion and all other conceivable things. For with such men God and all that pertains to Him are only a partial phenomenon in the general outfolding of man's creative activity. Surely we must share the horror of the Pope at the easy blasphemies of Modernism when we hear James, one of its main forerunners, coolly say, "On pragmatistic principles, if the hypothesis (note the word!) of God works satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true" ("Prag.," 299), this "widest sense" being, of course, the pragmatistic sense. And any fair-minded reader must surely deprecate with all his heart the state of mind which suggests, and the derogation of God's honor which follows, expressions such as the following: "She (Pragmatism) will take a God who lives in the very dirt of private fact, if that should seem a likely place to find Him" (Prag., 80). "Pragmatism has to postpone dogmatic answer, for we do not yet know certainly which type of religion is going to work best in the long run" (Pr., 300). "The scale of evil actually in sight defies all human tolerance" . . . "A God Who can relish such superfluities of horrors is no God for human being to appeal to." "His animal spirits are too high" (pp. 142-143). "Free will is thus a general cosmological theory of promise, just like Absolute, God, Spirit or Design." "Taken abstractedly, no one of these terms has any inner content, none of them gives us any picture, and none of them would retain the least pragmatic value in a world whose character was obviously perfect from the start" . . . "Other than this practical significance, the words God, free will, design, etc., have none." . . . "If you stop, in dealing with such words, with their definition, thinking that to be an intellectual finality, where are you?" "Stupidly staring at a pretentious sham." "Deus est Ens, a se, extra et supra omne genus, necessarium, unum,

infinite perfectum, simplex, immutabile, immensum, aeternum, intelligens," etc—wherein is such a definition really instructive? "It means less than nothing in its pompous robe of adjectives." "Pragmatism alone can read a positive meaning into it, and for that she turns her back upon the intellectualist point of view altogether" (Pr., 119, 120, 121). And these are the men that these novelty-seeking Catholics called Modernists have weakly chosen to follow! An untamed ukraine is indeed most thrillingly picturesque as its hoofs strikes fire from the city streets, but yet its real place is out upon its native plain, not amidst the cultured and sacred homes of men. And such are men like James. Endowed by God with commanding talent, they are simply destroyers, because they have never refined their native worth in the calm and gentle school of Him Who was meek and humble of heart.

We have reached that point in which the individual's creative rôle is asserted, openly by Pragmatism, covertly and indirectly by Modernism; and from all we have seen there can be, it would seem, but little doubt that here at least the argument "post hoc, ergo propter hoc" is not the only one that draws the beginnings of Modernism from Pragmatism. But the same connection and derivation appears even more plainly when we reach the part where Modernism, as Pope Pius points out, affirms a collective and successive religious sense, faith and consciousness, which collective entity undergoes a ceaseless evolution both in itself and its products, and becomes for Modernists the last tribunal of all reality and of all right, just as James has just said that the word "God" means just as much and just as little as the idea of God proves to work out usefully in a life such as Pragmatists lead—a life of pure egotism. "Further," says Pope Pius, "in order that we may finish this matter concerning faith and its varied development, it remains, venerable brethren, that we hear the precepts of Modernism explaining these two things." "The general principle is this: In any religion that is a living one there is nothing that is not variable, and therefore to be varied." "And thus they proceed to that which in their doctrine is the head of all; that is, to evolution." "And therefore dogma, the Church, reverence for holy things, the books we hold to be sacred, yea, even faith itself, unless we wish all these to be moribund, must be governed by the laws of evolution." And then the saddened Pontiff goes on to relate the consequently wholly deformed ideas of God and of all holy things given by this movement from inward to outward—not from God to man—a movement held within proper bounds, the Modernists say, by the traditions of the Church as recording universal Christian consciousness—by the Church, therefore, of the Modernists—and ever impelled forward—and this is

the important point, for on it all progress depends—impelled forward by the deep inner consciousness of superior individual men, of those who "reach life more intimately," a phraseology vividly recalling the ancient Gnostic "Spiritules" as contrasted with the "Carnales," as also the esoteric and exoteric distinctions of Theosophy and allied cults. We need not say that in the concrete these more exalted individuals are none other than the leading Modernists themselves, as the open disgust of their Pragmatist teaches for the coarse common crowd can abundantly show, the fact always remaining that individual and private religious "sense" is the ultimate source of all religious reality. And again we know where this could at least have come from when we hear James declaring that "our acts, our turning places, where we seem to make ourselves (creators) and to grow, are the parts of the world to which we are closest, the parts of which our knowledge is the most intimate and complete." And the same conclusion is likewise strongly suggested when we hear him jauntily say that "the original polytheism of mankind has only imperfectly sublimated itself into monotheism," and that this monotheism, "as far as it was religious and not a scheme of classroom instruction for the metaphysicians, has always viewed God as but one helper, primus inter pares, in the midst of all the shapers of the great world's fate" (Prag., p. 289). "I believe that we stand in much the same relation to the whole of the universe that our canine and feline pets do to the whole of human life" (Ibid, 300). "Pragmatism," as we have quoted before, "has to postpone dogmatic answer, for we do not yet know certainly what type of religion is going to work best in the long run" (Prag., 300). "Our acts," again we quote, "our turning places, where we seem to ourselves to make ourselves and grow, are the parts of the world to which we are closest, the parts of which our knowledge is the most intimate and complete." "Why should we not take them at their face value?" "Why may they not be the turning places and growing places, which they seem to be, of the world; why not the workshop of being, where we catch fact in the making, so that nowhere may the world in any other kind of way than this?" (Prag., 287). "We create the subjects of our true as well as of our false propositions" (Prag., 254). "The stubborn fact remains that there is a sensible flux; what is true of it seems from first to last to be largely a matter of our own creation. We build the flux out inevitably" (Prag., 300). In logical sequence, therefore, both Pragmatism and its faithful follower, Modernism, take every care that in all interrelations the human "creator" shall ever subject his idea of God to the demands of sense perceptions. And he does this precisely in order to avoid any subjection of himself to powers he grants to

be allied in some way to his ideas of religion. Faith for the Modernist, as the Pope points out, is in itself wholly distinct from all the data of sense and from all things of the material order. The Church likewise belongs to an order of things with which the State at no time comes into contact, as they say. But yet, in the proper and due evolution of which we just spoke, progress can be had, the Modernist asserts, not by the State paying any heed to the Church, but, vice versa, by the Church conforming itself in all ways to the modern ideas of civil society. As for the Pragmatists, we shall have occasion to meet their explicit, brutal avowal of complete insubordination to any authority—an insubordination which, in truth, the basic principles of Pragmatism would inexorably demand.

And now, for our own termination of this wearisome parallel of these so closely emulous errors, we may note the fact that while Pope Pius more than once indicates that the real leaders of Modernism are men who are outside of the Church and hostile to all its best interests, he nevertheless is not explicit in naming them, one reason being, no doubt, that he wished to remain consistent with his really specific aim, the correction of endangered and endangering Catholics, and did not, therefore, wish to be explicit with regard to any one else. But we are not restricted here by any such consideration, and every field of thought becomes clear just in proportion as the real sources of tendencies are sought for and found.

We may remark, too, that one further reason for instituting the comparison and claiming this basic connection that Pragmatism holds with regard to Modernism is the peculiar fact that, strange to say, as one writer speaking of Pragmatism puts it, "Certain profoundly religious thinkers hoped to find in this change of the concept of science and in this diminution of its claims the principle of a new concept of the relations existing between science and religion and the source of a real religious triumph" (Larousse Mensuel, Paris, January, 1909, p. 392). For this is precisely the apologetic pretension of Modernism, and again the parallel becomes apparent between these two allied and aberrant systems of thought.

As a still further concatenation it seems well to note here, too, the Holy Father's assignment of pride as the principal moral cause of Modernistic errors and to mark the justification of this assignment in the system from which it would seem that Modernism has sprung. We already have noticed the manner and words of James concerning the sublimest thesis of Scholastic Theology—the manner and words, that is, in which he equivalently declares that without the aid of his favorite Pragmatism we, in looking at the glorious thesis that announces God's infinite attributes, are "stupidly staring at a pretentious sham!" (Prag., 121), telling us likewise

that "it means less than nothing in its pompous robe of adjectives," and that "Pragmatism alone can read any positive meaning into it." Whereupon we may be allowed to observe that it is much more easy thus to deride scholastic theology and philosophy than to master their delicate intricacies, and that therefore limited minds that want to be heard or powerful ones that are too impatient are very apt to take the former course. Mr. James, too, though for a long time affecting the utmost courtesy and complete *bonhomie* for all but the Church's adherents, at last forgets himself under the constant strain of opposition to his dictatorial utterances, and finally cries out, rather inelegantly, "Here I take the bull by the horns, and in spite of the whole crew of rationalists and monists, of whatever brand they may be, I ask 'why not?' " And he asks this triumphant rhetorical question in regard to his own preceding one, "Does our act then *create* (the italics are James') the world's salvation so far as it makes room for itself, so far as it leaps into the gap? Does it create, not the whole world's salvation, of course, but just so much of this as itself covers of the world's extent?" It is clear that both question and answer contain nothing except the senseless pride that would raise even each individual to the real rank of an independent creator, a creator entitled to despise the "whole crew" of dissenters; and in this both Pragmatism and Modernism are surely agreed.

Again, as the Holy Pope points out, Modernism hates Christ. Professor James, a typical Pragmatist, has in his book on that subject not a single mention of Christ from cover to cover, though Walt Whitman, the so-called "cow-pen poet" of Camden, wandering Indian "Swami," and pantheistic apostles of every kind find a repeated and respectful consideration.

The Holy Father says that pantheistic conceptions square best with Modernistic doctrines, and James, after reciting the doctrine of the Swami Vivekananda (sic), tells us that "in the centre, the reality, there is no one to be mourned for, no one to be sorry for. He has penetrated everything, the Pure One, the Formless, the Bodiless, the Stainless, He the Knower, He the great Poet, the Self-existent, He who is giving to every one what he deserves." And of this—contrast his words on the parallel scholastic thesis—he says: "Surely we have here a religion which, emotionally considered, has a high pragmatic value; it imparts a perfect sumptuosity of security." And Modernism places all its security in its own creative centre, the centre of each individual consciousness, while yet seeming to affirm the existence of some vast unknown.

Passing, then, to the more specific character and life of Modernism in itself, we shall find it fully worthy of its infected pragmatic cradle. And a fully authentic list of the realms invaded by it can

be found in the Pope's enumeration of the various personalities which the typical Modernist pretends to assume. For one and the same apostle of this new cult assumes without trepidation the many and varied responsibilities of philosopher, believer, theologian, historian, critic, apologist and reformer of religious things; and he roams over this vast and highly cultivated extent like some savage animal coursing at will amongst the most beautiful parterres of exquisite exotic flowers. For the wretched practical ruin due to the Modernist's unrestrained activity can be seen likewise in the most authentic manner in the Decree "Lamentabili" of the Holy Office, in which no less than sixty-five palmary condemned propositions were necessary to cover even in general terms the errors expressing in the concrete the deadly heresies of this upstart system. And this list of condemnations is not, like some of its predecessors, thus numerous because it deals minutely with the varied details of some one capital error, but because Modernism has attacked the principal points in every conceivable part of the whole Christian religion, as well as those of all merely natural reasoning and of sound philosophy.

Separate study would, we need not say, be required in order to gain any proper knowledge of the Modernist's special manner of acting in the multiplex personalities which he has assumed; and it will here suffice, therefore, to say that with his own preconceived, irresponsible principles as his only and constant guide, he gives to all the character of philosopher, believer and critic, as well as to all the rest, a method whose only ultimate intent is, as before, to support the general system which he professes, which system, as already declared, has in its turn for its one ultimate object the assertion of the individual man as finally and fully supreme, and this with regard to God as well as with regard to all lesser things.

As for the Decree "Lamentabili," with its list of condemned propositions, it fully shows that this pretentious system of Modernism vitally attacks the very bases of all reason and all truth, and therefore of all knowledge, both human and divine; for amongst many other equally subversive assertions it declares that "truth is not any more invariable than is man himself, since it is something that is evolved with him and in him and by him" (Prop. 58). And it must be remembered that for Modernism God Himself also owes even His very existence to an inner, intrinsic exigence of man, so that the last words of the proposition just quoted would practically substitute man for God in the sacred text, "In Him we live and move and be" (Acts xvii., 28), as also in that other equally sublime, "Of Him, and by Him, and in Him, are all things" (Rom. xi., 36). For it is of man, and not of God, that we have just

heard Modernism say that truth is something tha t is evolved "with him, and in him, and by him," certainly a close alignment and one that must recall again the similarly all-creating claims of Pragmatism.

As for Revelation in general, there are three propositions, in which, by asserting its interior and denying its exterior origin, Modernism destroys Revelation altogether, and by denying its apostolic completion and its proper connection with dogma, leaves the way open for all innovations and breaks down at pleasure all the already established dogmatic truths, for it openly says that "Revelation could not be anything else than the consciousness acquired by man of his relation to God" (Prop. 20).

And as to the two great vehicles of Revelation, the eternally spoken word Christ and the Sacred Scriptures, Christ is attacked in twelve blasphemous assertions (27-38) concerning His nature, His ministry, His death, His resurrection, and all denying what is most important to be believed concerning Him—His divinity and His effective mediation for man.

The Scriptures are indirectly assailed in many regards, and they are directly attacked in thirteen separate propositions, which fact links the present Encyclical up with that of Leo XIII., "Providentissimus Deus," which revealed and condemned Modernism's first poisoned activity, bent as it then was towards the fatal vitiation and final destruction of the very well-springs of faith. The ninth proposition can serve as a sufficient example. "Those who believe that God is really the author of the Sacred Scriptures betray unpardonable simplicity or ignorance" (P. 9).

As to the earthly custodians and propagators of true Revelation, as to the Church with the Roman Pontiff and his assisting congregations—agencies which the Modernists recognize as their only effectual opposers—these are attacked in fourteen assertions, all tending to enervate a power so distasteful to Modernistic ideas. As to the Church, its magisterium and its ministerium are both denied in every real regard. It is denied all real rights of any kind concerning the guarding and interpretation of the Scriptures, of requiring any real assent to her dogmatic definitions, and it has no voice whatever regarding the dicta of what is known as human studies as distinguished from those that are related to sacred things.

As for the Roman Pontiff, we need not marvel that he has fully shared the contumely so impiously poured out by the Modernists upon the Divine Master Whom he represents and upon His first earthly representative. We have seen what Modernism says of Christ, and now we are told by it that "St. Peter never even sus-

pected that Christ had given him primacy in the Church" (P. 55), and if this is so of Peter, it need not be said that the present claim is an absurd pretention and usurpation. The Roman congregations —always, and now perhaps more than ever, the favorite objects of attack for the skulking class of heretics and insubordinates—are calmly dismissed in one proposition, which says that "those who pay no attention whatever to the condemnations promulgated by the Sacred Congregation of the Index and by the other Sacred Roman congregations are to be considered as free from all blame" (8), and indeed even one proposition of this kind seems ample, even for the most Modernistic demands.

As for Revelation's internal effect, faith, and as to its complex dogmatic and moral object, all are inverted in order to serve Modernistic preconceptions. And in the case of moral teaching a very ingenious device is used, the device of a practically absolute silence concerning ordinary moral obligations. But no one who knows human nature need be in any doubt of the fate of all decent morality, once man himself is made, as Modernism makes him, the origin, the rule and the judge of all things. For Modernism man is a real creator, the creator—all-blasphemous though the assertion be—even of God Himself, and therefore Modernism need feel no fear of any avenger, it need fear no hell, for nothing can be wrong, nothing can be avenged, which springs up from man himself, the primal fount of all reality. Given a Modernistic triumph and all the enormities of paganism—which yet had some idea of real gods and of real reward and punishments—will pale into an almost honorable insignificance beside those of its belated successor.

And with its assertion of complete irresponsibility thus purposely concealed, the Modernists proceed to attack all that could make it insecure. For in the Modernistic idea faith is merely the product of a material movement of a material organ, a pulsation, as it were, of the material heart; for to them faith is merely an outcome of sense, and sense must use corporeal instruments. And no one need say that any God and any faith and any dogma cast forth by a merely material force-pump—and the heart is just this—can never exert any binding force upon the minds or the morals of men. God is already accounted for by Modernism in their general "vital immanence," which gives the birth and progress of all things that exceed the phenomenal world. Faith is this "religious sense" and consciousness itself, and dogma is only that part of individual vagaries that creative, supra-phenomenal evolution has assumed to itself—a kind of adapted "survival of the fittest" in a wholly internal religious experience. It takes the whole exposition of Modernistic theories to tell us this about God, and it takes six distinct propo-

sitions to tell us the rest concerning faith and dogma and their allied derivations.

The general truths of the sacraments are denied in three propositions, and each separate sacrament is then attacked in turn by propositions special to itself, baptism having a double share of abuse, as being the gateway to all the rest, and sacred orders also, because from these the administration of the sacraments in general depends. And penitence, too, the especial hatred of pride, the one we all need so much, and none more than the Modernists in their obstinate arrogance, is made the object of a specially deadly assault.

And lastly, even the familiar and venerable "Apostles' Creed" that we all have loved so much, the sacred echo of infancy and innocence and of awakening religious truths, is not, we are told by Modernism, in its principal articles the same for us that it was for the early Christians (62).

After all this we are not surprised to learn from the Modernists that "dogmas, sacraments and the hierarchy, both as regards their concept and their reality, are nothing more than interpretations and evolutions coming from Christian understanding, which, by means of external increments, augmented and perfected the slight germ hidden in the Gospel" (54). Nor, therefore, are we surprised to know from the same source that "the progress of science demands that there be a reformation of the concepts held by the Christian religion concerning God, the Creation, Revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word and the Redemption" (64). Nor are we more surprised to hear the allied Modernistic deduction that "the Catholicism of the present cannot be reconciled with true science unless it be transformed into a kind of non-dogmatic Christianity; that is, into a wide and liberal Protestantism" (65). Surely it would be difficult—it would be impossible—to find any sacred fact or any sacred belief that Modernism would not wholly destroy.

Such was the foe that drew forth all the best forces of Pius the Tenth, and we well may believe that he himself would welcome no better memorial than even the feeblest of echoes that seeks to repeat the fearless war he waged against them in the sacred cause of religious truth. And we need not say that it was a struggle at whose side mere diplomatic entanglements and finesse begin to look small. We have given this somewhat lengthened analysis of the Modernistic question because its absence from any account of Pope Pius would seem like the recent titanic struggles in France without Mons and Charleroi or La Marne. And we have placed the parallel with Pragmatism in order to show Modernism's deeper roots and character, and thus to explain that Pius was combating a foreign foe as well as a domestic enemy; was combating not alone his own

disobedient children, who have shown much more of stubbornness than of talent, but was struggling also against the most brilliant of the new and Satanic philosophers that recent years have brought into prominence in America, England, France and Italy—a reason, in turn, doing much to explain this otherwise unexplainable obstinacy on the part of so many mediocre men. For just as Pragmatism was breaking up outside the Church by its own illogical weight, a group of inferior minds within its pale, most probably ignorant of their fallen guide's later vicissitudes, made the pitiable mistake of lengthening Pragmatism's waning life by its new application in Modernism. But still, thanks to Pius, we nevertheless can say of Modernism what Van Biéma has said of its parent, Pragmatism—that, namely, "It neglects essential aspects of reality and cannot disentangle itself from internal contradiction." "Religious Pragmatism"—a very apt designation for Modernism—"cannot go to the end of its thought without breaking with the dogmas it desires to save." (Larousse Mensuel, Paris, January, 1909, p. 393.)

For Pius has conquered. Some lingering resistance still remains, but under his leading this creeping error has been uncovered; men have been obliged to declare themselves under oath; the faithful episcope of the Church has loyally supported its great leader, and even the friends of every serious religion outside of the Church have unitedly risen to resist and destroy a system which, if successful, must inevitably force the surrender of every pathway and every stronghold leading natural or supernatural truth and happiness. Yet, still again, it remains an untold pity thus to see minds outside of the Church possessed of a perception of religious truth much clearer than that possessed by many within its bosom.

II. PIUS THE TENTH AND PHILOSOPHY.

We have recounted an issue which, while it involved the very foundations and the deepest principles of philosophy, was still in the main theological, for all movements are properly specified by their real "terminus ad quem," and the whole ultimate end and aim of Modernism was the complete substitution of one religious system for another.

But Pius was well aware that theology as a science is but the orderly complexus of related conclusions drawn by sane philosophy from the primal and unquestioned data of divine revelation and authority. He knew that true philosophy is really the handmaid and, technically speaking, an indispensable handmaid of theology in its scientific aspects; of theology, that is, in its specifically scientific conclusions and as distinguished from the body of basic truths which came down from heaven without reason's aid, or were

repeated in order to strengthen some of its already found knowledge. And thus from the very beginning the anxious Pope looked sedulously to the all-important outlying strongholds of true philosophy. "As to what specifically pertains to theology," he says, "we have always wished this study to be illustrated by the philosophy (that of St. Thomas) of which we speak." (Ap. Sed., 6, July, 1914, p. 338.) 'We must reject," he also says, "the opinion of certain older teachers that it makes no difference to the truth of faith what any one may think concerning created things, provided that he thinks aright of God, since error concerning the nature of things brings forth a false knowledge of God; so that we must keep sacred and inviolate the principles of philosophy placed by St. Thomas, by means of which there is obtained a knowledge of creatures such as most aptly coheres with faith, and by which all the errors of epochs are refuted, and by which it becomes possible to know what are to be attributed to God and to Him alone, and by which there is wondrously illustrated both the diversity and analogy which intervenes between God and His works." (Ap. Sed., 6 July, 1914, p. 337.)

"For the points that are principal in the philosophy of St. Thomas should not be considered as belonging to opinions concerning which one is free to discuss either for or against." "But they should be held to be the foundations in which our entire knowledge of divine things are laid, and from the removal of which, or from their deprivation in any manner, it would necessarily follow that the students of the sacred branches of learning would not even understand the signification of the words in which divinely revealed dogmas are set forth by the teaching power of the Church." (Ap. Sed., 6 July, 1914, p. 338.) And he accordingly warns the teachers of Christian philosophy and of Sacred Theology that "the power of teaching has been granted to them, not for the purpose of communicating to their students the opinions pleasing to themselves, but in order that they may impart to them the teachings most approved by the Church." (Ap. Sed., 6 July, 1914, p. 338.)

"In these principles of St. Thomas," he still further says, "speaking of them in general and collectively taken, there is contained nothing but what the most noble philosophers and the principal doctors of the Church found out by meditation and discussion concerning the special characteristics of human knowledge, the nature of God and the nature of other things, the moral order and the attainment of the last end of life." "Nor will sane reason permit the neglect nor religion suffer the least diminution of so precious a wealth of knowledge which St. Thomas, having received it from his predecessors, refined and increased with his truly angelic talent

and made use of as the preparation, illustration and defense of sacred doctrine in human minds." "And this all the more from the fact that if Catholic truth be once deprived of this strong bulwark, aid for its defense will be sought in vain from that philosophy whose principles are also those of Materialism, Monism, Pantheism, Socialism, or certainly do not conflict with these." (Ap. Sed., 6 July, 1914, pp. 337-338.)

It was, therefore, with these principles fully in his mind that at the very beginning of his pontificate Pope Pius renewed all the teachings and all the directions concerning philosophy which had been promulgated by Leo XIII. in his great Encyclical, "Aeterni Patris," the whole intent of which was to make Scholastic Philosophy, in its typical Thomistic form, the basis of all the philosophy taught in the Catholic seminaries, universities and colleges of the world. And Pope Pius did this because, as Pope Leo points out, the teachings of Thomas were the best fitted for times such as ours. And Pius says in his own name that since his own pontificate had fallen upon more hostile to the wisdom of the Fathers than any that preceded, he deemed it of the very highest importance that Pope Leo's direction with regard to Scholastic Philosophy should be most accurately observed and most sedulously extended (Acta S., Sedis xxxvi., 469.) He himself directs that "All, whoever they may be and in whatever part of the earth they may be situated, who teach philosophy in Catholic schools should never depart from the way or the method of St. Thomas Aquinas, but should day by day more diligently and carefully follow in his footsteps." (Acta S. Sedis,, xxxvi., 470.)

Later on, in addressing the Bishops in charge of the Institute Catholique of Paris, he said: "As for philosophy, we request that you should never allow in your seminaries any relaxed observance of the precepts most providentially given by our predecessors. This is a matter of great importance to the custody and safeguarding of the faith. (Acta S. Sedis, xl., 391.) These last words are prophetic in regard to Modernism, whose everywhere self-contradicting absurdities never could have gained a foothold in any mind endowed with even the initial logic of Scholasticism.

And what Pope Pius said in this regard before Modernism had fully developed, he said with even more of saddened earnestness and firmness in its very presence. For in the great Encylical "Pascendi," in which he sets forth all the deadly errors of Modernism, he puts down in the very first place and number amongst the remedies to be applied against so fatal a pest the same explicit directions concerning scholastic philosophy. "First, therefore," he says, "with regard to studies, we wish and completely command that

scholastic philosophy be placed as the foundation of Christian studies." "And what is principal in this is by the scholastic philosophy which we command to be followed, we mean particularly that which was taught by St. Thomas, concerning which philosophy we desire all that was decreed by our predecessor to remain in force, and in so far as it may be necessary, we renew it all, and confirm it, and strictly command that it be observed by all." "It will be the duty of Bishops, if this has been neglected anywhere in the seminaries, to urge and force its observance in the future." "We command the same to the generals of religious orders." "And we warn teachers that they properly remember that to desert Aquinas, especially in metaphysics, cannot be done without great loss." (Acta S. Sedis, 1907, 640.) Likewise, in granting to the new Benedictine College of St. Anselm, in Rome, the power of granting academic degrees both in philosophy and theology, the Pope speaks of "St. Thomas, whose golden doctrine illuminates minds with its splendor; whose way and method leads without any danger of error to the most profound knowledge of divine things" (Ap. Sed., 6 July, 1914, p. 334), and also, after granting this power, he adds: "In order that this privilege may bring all the more salutary fruit to the order and to the Church, we wish and we direct that both in philosophy and theology the professors of the Anselmian College always follow the teaching of Aquinas." He directs, moreover, that in the studies of those who wish to receive degrees in theology the very text of St. Thomas be used (cf. Ap. Sedis, 6 July, 1914, p. 339), adding finally the repetition that "to desert Aquinas, especially in philosophy and theology, cannot, as we have already said, be done without great detriment, while to follow him is a most secure pathway to a profound knowledge of divine things." (Ibid, p. 335.)

After all this one would surely think that the weary old Pope's work in this regard was sufficiently done, at least in so far as Catholics were concerned. But human nature is a very incomprehensible thing, and Pius was compelled to return yet again to this matter, since, as he himself declares in referring to his own preceding Encyclical against Modernism, "From the fact that he had said that the philosophy of St. Thomas was to be *principally* used, some had persuaded themselves that they were following his wishes, or at least not opposing them, if they felt free to make promiscuous use of the philosophical doctrines of some particular scholastic doctor, even though these were contrary to those of St. Thomas." "But," he now added, "they were greatly mistaken. For it is clear that when we placed St. Thomas as the principal leader in our philosophical schools we wished this to be understood in an especial

manner of those principles upon which that philosophy depends as fundamental." (Ap. Sed., 6 July, 1914, 337.)

And further still, not deeming even this enough, he took, just before he died, the supremely effective step of prescribing for explicit teaching and prescribing in text the most specific and fundamental tenets of the philosophy he had previously commanded. Through the Congregation of Studies he issued, on the 27th of July, 1914, a decree approving as fundamental, in the sense of which he had already spoken, twenty-four theses belonging to the philosophy of St. Thomas and dealing especially with its metaphysical aspects. This body of theses will doubtless be added at once to Catholic philosophical text-books, and will thus form an invaluable "medulla" of scholastic philosophy in its specifically Thomistic form.

III. SACRED SCRIPTURES.

From the propositions recited by the Holy Office and already given here, it is plain that Pius was by no means unaware of the urgent necessity of guarding this written part of the deposit of faith from the Modernistic vandals who, knowing its irreconcilable opposition to all their most cherished tenets, sought by an array of false and empty erudition to rob these divine writings of all their true standing and force. And here, too, with that continuity which has ever marked the Holy See, the chain of protecting legislation stretched from Leo to Pius in regard to the abuse of Scriptural studies, just as it did in the case of unsound philosophical experiments; so that just as the great Encyclical "Æterni Patris" of Leo could serve as a basis for the further required directions of Pius concerning philosophy, so the commanding utterance, "Providentissimus Deus," issued by Leo on the 18th of November, 1893, concerning Scriptural subjects (Acta Leo, v., 200), could and did serve Pope Pius in his conflict with Modernistic Scriptural errors, while Pope Leo's Apostolic Letter "Vigilantiæ studiique memores" of October 28, 1902, with its establishment of the "Biblical Commission," gave the occasion for the "Motu Proprio" of Pius, dated November 18, 1907, declaring the decisions of the commission to be of equal rank with those of the Roman Congregations in general and making them binding, under the severest of penalties, upon the consciences of all. As to the specific provisions added by Pius regarding the study of Scripture, these are to be found in the Apostolic Letter of March 27, 1906, and in the "Motu Proprio" of November 18, 1907, the last principally concerning the work of the Biblical Commission established by Leo XIII. on October 30, 1902—a commission whose office may be said to have been completed by the "Biblical Institute" established by Pius himself on the 7th

of May, 1900. And all these fundamental regulations are to have a profound effect upon the new Latin edition of the "Vulgate," another imposing work inaugurated by this universally thoughtful Pontiff and referred to in the related documents of April 30, 1907, and of December 3, 1907.

IV. CATECHETICAL INTEREST AND ZEAL.

Extending this truly paternal solicitude for the proper education of youth still further, extending it even to infancy, and extending it there precisely because he knew the commanding importance of early education, because he knew that "Out of the mouth of infants and of sucklings Thou hast perfected praise" (Ps. viii., 3), because he wished it to be said of each of his little children of the fold, as was said of the Divine Child, their heavenly model, "The child grew, and waxed strong; and the grace of God was in Him" (Luke ii., 40); because he desired with all his heart that like Him all these little ones should advance "in wisdom and age and grace with God and man" (Luke ii., 52); because of all this one of his first and deepest and most earnestly pressed objects of zeal was for the careful and effectual catechetical instruction of the young and for such as had reached maturer years without this necessary training. And for the same end he secured the publication of a specially prepared catechism, which has reached wide circulation through many translations.

And then in the Encyclical Letter "Acerbo nimis" of the 15th of April, 1905, led by the laxity and weakness of soul that he everywhere saw, and which he ascribes principally to the lack of knowledge of divine things, he says, "Where the mind is covered with the darkness of crass ignorance there can be no right will and no proper morals." Certainly the pity which we show towards the poor for the purpose of removing their trials has great praise with God." "But who will deny that a praise far greater belongs to the zeal and the labor by which, through teaching and admonition, we secure not passing advantages for the body, but eternal profit for souls?" In this document he gives most careful and detailed prescriptions, and in six canons provides for this for proper catechetical instruction, especially in regard to the young, but also not forgetting, as we have indicated, the needs of those of more advanced age who still remain insufficiently instructed in the main outlines of the faith.

V. HOLY COMMUNION.

We have recounted great things, and yet it may truly be said that only now are we approaching the work that ever shall mark

the reign of Pius the Tenth. His first announced purpose was "to restore all things in Christ," and Christ was indeed the great love of his heart, as is easily visible in the anguish he feels in the places where he speaks of Modernism's especial insults to the Divine Redeemer. And love is never content with mere theoretic vindication. It wants to stoop and repair the injury done. And Pius knew, too, that all the other things of which we have spoken were addressed to the mind of man, whereas that is not his sole specific power. He has a will with which to do, or refuse to do, that which the intellect dictates. He has a heart to love, as well as a mind to know. And Pius knew also that in the ultimate test the heart is the more important of the two, since from it there depends our whole moral standing. "Far, indeed, are we from asserting," he says, "that depravity of mind and corruption of morals cannot be joined with a knowledge of religion." ("Acerbo minis," 15 April, 1905.) And thus it was that after giving, by all his great Encyclicals and by all his other instructional works, that light which the mind must have, his great heart found its truly congenial employment in Christ as the strength of the weak, in Him as "the way and the truth and the life" (John xiv., 6); in Him as One Who had said, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you" (John vi., 5), and the tenderly loving regulations contained in the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Council of December 20, 1905; December 7, 1906 (S. Amer., 813, 820, 821), and April 10, 1907, as well as in that of the Sacred College of the Sacraments dated August 8, 1910 (Acta S. Sed., 1910, 250), show all this deep and practical love of his heart—a love in which the Pontiff does but recall the faithful of these later times to the theory and the practice of the earlier Church.

Commencing from his deep regard for the little ones of Christ, we can see how Pius remembered that Peter had heard the gentle command, "Feed My lambs;" how he remembered that Christ had forbidden the disciples to repel the little children that instinctively sought His side, but told them, on the contrary, that we all must be like to them, for of such was the kingdom of heaven. "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Mark x., 14). And it is indeed touching to read the Pontiff's reasoning in this regard, and to see how he still defends the little ones, and directs that even discussion is unlawful in their regard; that the only thing ministers of the Church are allowed to do is to give the little ones their food divine, without permitting any worldly-wise criticism of the tender union of God with the pure and innocent souls of childhood.

For in the Decree "Quam singulari," emanating under his direction and approval from the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, August 8, 1910 (Acta S. Sed., 1910, 250), he recites all the acts of this tender love of Christ for the little ones, as narrated by the Gospels concerning Christ, and recalls that we must become like them, and that on the same divine authority any service rendered to them will be considered as if rendered to Christ Himself. Then passing to the Church in its imitation of its Divine Master, he tells how in the earlier ages up to the thirteenth century, and even now in the Church of the Greeks, even suckling infants were given the Holy Eucharist under the form of wine; and how, without reprobating this, the Latin Church, under the lead of the Fourth Lateral Council, in the year 1215, made the age of reason, the age of capability of mortal sin, the practical standard of the time, not for the privilege only, but also for the obligation—an obligation of the divine law itself—for the first reception of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. And making all this his own, the Pope then explains the slight knowledge required for this first Communion, and by suitable rules commands that the practices dictated by the principles announced be regularly and carefully carried out, even to the extent of the daily Communion of children who have reached the age of reason, "as Jesus Christ and the Mother Church desire." The refusal of the Holy Viaticum and Extreme Unction to the dying who have reached this age of reason without having received Holy Communion is condemned as an "altogether detestable abuse."

And what Pius did for the little ones he also did for the sick in their own measure, for on the 7th of December, 1906, he permitted the sick in religious or allied houses to receive Holy Communion twice a week and granting the same privilege twice a month to others not so situated, and this in both cases even when they had previously taken some liquid restorative after midnight. For the strong, for all, he reduced the number of confessions necessary for the obtaining of the great Eucharistic indulgences, and in every way encouraged close and constant approach to the Lord in the great sacrament of His daily love. For this purpose he, by the Decree "Sacra Tridentina Synodus" of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, December 20, 1905, gives Christ Himself as the Author of the desire of frequent Communion and the Jansenists as the authors of its strict limitation and rare administration. Excluding the pretext that in Holy Communion the first thing intended is the honor of God—the reason the strict affect—he quotes the Council of Trent to show that the really specific intention of God and of the Church in this most holy act is that the Most Holy Eucharist

may be "the antidote by which we are liberated from daily faults and are preserved from those that are mortal." And then, by proper and practical prescriptions, he marks the methods to be observed by all in this supreme matter, telling all finally to abstain in the future from any discussion as to the propriety of the course of action here set forth. These regulations are well known to all. No person and no set of persons free from mortal sin and desiring to approach the Holy Table can be prevented by any one from doing so.

VI. RESTORATION OF THE BREVIARY.

Though not so generally known, it is nevertheless the fact that the Sacred Office recited in the Breviary by all the higher clerics of the Church is closely connected, in a liturgical sense, with the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. For these Canonical Hours form the spiritual sacrifice of the great heart and mind of the Church, just as its real sacrifice is perfected in the Mass on the altar. And thus Pius the Tenth, after seeking to draw from that supreme sacrifice its full efficiency for the people through frequent and devout Communion, naturally turned his mind to this other great interior sacrifice of canonical prayer and sought to regulate it anew, and thus derive ever more and more benefit for the Christian peoples by its decorous beauty and power. And here again Pius is not an innovator. In this, as in all his other reforms touching the deep inner life of the Church, his only desire is to renew its first spirit and fervor to return to the primitive and unaffected devotion of its earlier days. No wrong was being done by the Breviary. Indeed, it was a very wealth of holiness that had increasingly embarrassed the office through the necessity of seeking to give due liturgical honor to the ever succeeding saints that were so frequently added to its lists of canonization. This had led to a very great displacement and omission of the older offices devoted more especially to the spirit of the varied seasons of the ecclesiastical year; and it is mainly this tendency that has been corrected; it is mainly the old "temporal" offices that have been restored; and this has been secured in large measure by the elimination of merely votive and octave offices. All these changes were discussed and effected principally by the Apostolic Constitutions "Divino afflatu" of November 1, 1911, and "Abhinc duos annos" of October 13, 1913. Practical experience shows that these changes were very judicious and desirable, the almost daily repetition of the same psalm in the old order tending to weary the mind and render it inattentive. And the same class of changes will finally affect the Missal.

VII. CHURCH MUSIC.

It may seem at first that the music of the Church forms but a very unimportant aspect of its many-sided life. But this is far from being the case. The matter was considered important enough to be mentioned under the inspiration of God in the Sacred Scriptures themseles, and this is sufficient warrant that music and singing have a really significant place in the ceremonial of the Church. "Wherefore become not unwise," says St. Paul, "but understanding what is the will of God, . . . be ye filled with the Holy Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord" (Eph. v., 17-19), an injunction which he repeats to the Colossians, "Admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual canticles, singing in grace in your hearts to God." (Col., iii., 16.)

And indeed any one who has known the crying abuses that existed for many years will readily grant that the reform of church music, the banishment, that is, of what was wholly unfit, and the full restoration of the Church's glorious but long discarded sacred and beautiful psalmody, was brought about none too soon. The frequenters of the theatres, blasé from the night before, came to church on Sundays merely to hear the same strains adapted to sacred words; and no one need be told of the more than anomaly thus constituted by habitually associating the sacred mysteries and the spiritual longings of the Church with the love-languishing voicings of merely natural passion.

With all this in mind, Pope Pius the Tenth at once put this reform into vigorous force by the Motu Proprio "Inter pastoralis" of November 22, 1903. And the entire spirit of this document is shown by its words, "Since it is our vehement desire that a truly Christian spirit may everywhere be renewed and inviolately preserved in all the faithful, it is necessary, first of all, that we should care for the sanctity and dignity of our sacred temples; of the places, that is, where the faithful are gathered together for the purpose of drawing this spirit from its one indispensable fount; that is, from the active communications in most sacred mysteries and in the public and solemn prayers of the Church." "But we shall uselessly hope that the blessings of God will be poured abundantly down upon us for this end, if our worship of God, instead of ascending in the odor of sweetness, places, on the contrary, in the hands of the Lord the lash with which the Divine Redeemer elsewhere drove out the unworthy desecrators from the temple."

Conditions almost or quite prohibitive in some places have thus far impeded the full realization of these necessary restorations of

proper liturgical decorum in this regard, but much has already been accomplished, and we may justly hope that the worst abuses have now disappeared forever.

VIII. NEW CODIFICATION OF CANON LAW.

The discipline of the Church is one thing, its dogma quite another. The first is elastic and variable, the second immutable. And thus it is that the Church is fitting both for time and eternity. Like eternal truth, it remains immutable in its body of revealed doctrine, while at the same time, like the other living organisms that God has placed in this world of change, it is free to adapt itself in its outer life to the varying earthly conditions through which its world-long life must pass. And thus the regulations of mere disciplinary practice which filled a very important part in one age may be supplanted with advantage by others in other epochs; in epochs, that is, whose life, owing to the changes that the centuries inevitably bring, may be cast in channels widely divergent from those of preceding times.

And one may easily imagine the cloud of rules and laws that the Church must have needed since it first received from Christ the plenary assurance and command, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (Matt. xvi., 19.) Age after age has necessarily furnished its quota of decrees of all kinds, until the famous "Corpus Juris" is fairly dismaying in its bulky proportions and demands long years of the closest toil for even a comparatively proper acquaintance with its prolific contents. And thus the real difficulty of a new codification lies precisely in the fact that there is nothing even in that vast collection which can truly be called useless. On the contrary, this long series of consistent decisions, retaining few principles, but giving a vast explanation, form an invaluable deposit of practical legislative acumen and resource. The pruning, therefore, which the ages demand must be done with extreme caution and nicety, unless it is to destroy much more than it gains.

And yet Pius attacked this monumental work, too, and the result, though not yet complete, already promises the most valuable fruit. The new Codex is appearing in installments, as it were, in the new "Apostolic Sedis," the "Official Commentary"—also originated by Pius—which authentically records all the activity of the Supreme Pontiff and his imposing Curia. This beautiful and completed periodical commences with the year 1909 and supersedes the former analogous "Acta Sanctæ Sedis" of many past years. The object sought in the revision of the Codex will simply be the removal of

all the regulations that changed conditions have deprived of their practical value, the concise statement of the many remaining laws that the wide activity of the Church must ever require, and a similar orderly presentment of such new rules as may be found necessary. It may be of interest to note here that well informed authorities consider that the one possibility of this vast and difficult work at this time is due to the commanding erudition and ability of Cardinal Gasparri, a typical dignitary of the later days, raised to the purple by Pius the Tenth.

IX. THE NEW ROMAN CURIA.

To grapple with all these more than herculean labors and to prosecute them with vigor and efficiency, the Pope effected a profound change in the constitution and allotted duties of the various congregations and tribunals constituting the Curia and allied bodies at Rome. The detailed list of these important modifications can be seen in the Apostolic Constitutions "Sapienti Consilio" of June 29, 1908, and "Lex Propria" of the same date, concerning the Sacred Rota and the "Signatura Apostolica." The entire scope of these changes is given by the Pontiff himself in the first named document, and it is that "the Roman Curia, having been arranged in a manner that is pertinent and clear to all, may be able to give its aid and its assistance all the more readily and more perfectly to the Roman Pontiff and to the Church." (Acta S. Sedis., 1908, p. 426.) As to the methods by which this great result is sought, they were such as the changed times in which we live suggested to the Pope himself and to the experienced men at his side.

As to the personnel of these great congregations, its guiding spirits are the Cardinals remaining from the nominations of Leo or constituted by Pope Pius, and the list of these will show that at no period in the history of the Church were the members of the Sacred College more justly celebrated for learning, sanctity or power.

X. PERSONAL APPEARANCE.

In personal appearance Pope Pius the Tenth was of medium height, solidly, but not heavily built, and there was an appearance of quiet self-possession and dignity about his person, without any suggestion of self-sufficiency or arrogance. But the especial feature of his whole personal bearing was formed by his eyes, from which there issued an expression of child-like simplicity, happiness and innocence with which it was evident nothing in his long and important experience had been allowed to interfere. He was extremely simple and unaffected in his manners, the elaborate ceremonial of

Roman etiquette being very evidently distasteful to him in many ways, in so far as it related to himself in any personal manner.

He was born June 2, 1825; ordained priest September 18, 1858; consecrated Bishop of Mantua November 10, 1884; created Cardinal and Patriarch of Venice June 15, 1893; elected Pope August 4, 1903, and crowned on August 9 of the same year, dying on the 30th day of August, 1914, in the eightieth year of his age.

Surely, then, as we stand by his bier and gaze on those childlike eyes now closed forever to earth, we may lay on the silent lips of the old, exhausted Pope the inspired words which he never would have said himself, but which are true in the fullest degree: "Lord, Thou didst deliver to me five talents; behold, I have gained other five over and above," and surely we hear the gratified Lord's returning answer, "Well done, good and faithful servant; because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many; enter thou into the joy of the Lord." (Matt. xxv., 20-21.) "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." And we shall add in his name, "As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me in that day: and not only to me, but to them also that love His coming." (II. Timothy iv., 8.)

BENEDICT XV.

And now is it too much to repeat in a modified sense the words of the Lord that the gates of hell should never prevail against His Church, and thus say, "The Pope is dead. Long live the Pope?" For the hand of the Lord seems almost visible here, seems almost plainly visible in this selection of Benedict the Fifteenth. For, again, it is clear that when the all but universal cataclysm of blood now devastating Europe will have subsided, a strong and skilled diplomatic hand will again be needed to draw from the readjustments that must take place whatever of proper recognition for the Church the times will permit; and the personal experience of Pope Benedict XV., both in his own fields and in closest and most important association with those consummate masters of diplomacy, Leo and Rampolla, will render him prompt and effective in this difficult task. On the doctrinal side the felicity of his election seems in nowise less apparent, for the crafty serpent of Modernism still lives a lingering life, and Benedict was made Archbishop of Bologna precisely because that city is one of the principal strongholds of Modernism, and was a see, therefore, which demanded his recognized personal fitness to combat this obstinate and multiplied error. And thus, both on the side of doctrine and on that of discipline, the present election seems to have been guided by God Himself, and we may well assume

that now, with all the ancient firmness of the Papacy and all the ever fertile youthfulness of truth divine, Benedict the Fifteenth will still, under God, guide the old Church, the only real glory of earth, with the invincible strength and the deathless attraction of that wondrous beauty ever ancient and ever new which leads through all the light and charm of this world to the ever fadeless magnificence of the world that is to come.

DANIEL A. DEVER.

Chester Heights, Pa.

A NOTABLE CONVERT.

II.

THE summer of 1852 found Aubrey de Vere back in England. "The glamour with which he ever invested the objects of his reverence," says Mr. Ward, "now surrounded especially the Catholics whom he met. In August he visited the Vaughans at Courtfield. In September he stayed with his old friend, William Monsale, now a Catholic, at Tervoe, and there met Father Faber, erstwhile poet, admired of Wordsworth, well known to Miss Fenwick herself, and now, like Aubrey, a convert to Rome—a neophyte in his first fervor." Of the Vaughans he wrote in a letter to Miss Fenwick: "I have seldom seen such simply-noble, generous, devout and humble people. The beautiful mother of twelve children cannot feel satisfied unless her six sons all become priests and the six daughters nuns, though this would cause the extinction of one more of those old Catholic English families which for centuries have held their ground in stormier days than these." Of Faber, whom he heard preach a thrilling sermon in Limerick, he says: "His sufferings make him look fifteen years older than he is. . . . Though his ill health has been much increased by his unremitting labors, he has at least the consolation of knowing that those labors have brought forth fruit a hundredfold in the sanctification of multitudes who, but for him, would hardly have known that there is a God. . . . Seldom in my life have I been so deeply impressed by any one as by Faber. I could hardly name to you another who (so far as I may attempt to judge of such high matters appears to live so entirely in and for God. In that one thought he seems to live and breathe." At Grace Dieu, of which Wordsworth had sung, he found another typical Catholic household in proximity to a Cistercian monastery, where, in the most craggy and picturesque part of Charnwood Forest, the "chaunted rite" is again revived and

returns its antiphonal response to the same hymns which St. Benedict sang in the fifth and St. Bernard in the thirteenth century. The abbot told him that his first inclination to the monastic life had arisen from his reading those lines in the 'Excursion:'

> The life where Hope and Memory are one,
> Earth quiet and unchanged; the human soul
> Consistent in self-rule, and heaven revealed
> To meditation in that quietness.

This prompted the reflection: "Could he see that pile and the work it does, Wordsworth could not but rejoice, both as a patriot and as a poet, but most of all as a Christian: for in it he would see God glorified, the poor aided and the venerable strength of 'plain old times' not merely invoked, but evoked to sustain the weakness of these feeble and garrulous days." He soon afterwards rejoiced to hear that Wordsworth had actually visited the monastery of Mount St. Bernard, Leicestershire, and found his portrait hung there. He calls the Lisle Phillipps' "a lovely image of a Christian household," there being a choral service in the chapel morning and evening, the younger children dressed in red soutanes and acting as acolytes, until displaced by a still younger batch, the family already including twelve children. Phillipps was a firm believer in corporate reunion, fondly imagining that the whole Church of England would some time or other come back in a body; and therefore, although fifteen hundred people in the neighborhood had become Catholics, he was less anxious to promote individual conversions than any religious Catholic De Vere had ever met. Like some converts who idealize the Church and do not take sufficient count of human limitations, he notes down among his impressions: "Every day I am more convinced that the chief obstacle to the spread of Catholicity is to be found in the shortcomings of Catholics who so imperfectly correspond with the graces given to them." A tendency to pessimism is traceable in his train of thought. The outward world seemed to him to grow more restless every day—more bustling and more tumultuous about things of no real importance, and by contrast the conventual life the only life fit for people in their senses; "or, rather," he observes, "it would be so were it not for the many monks and nuns in the world who are the salt that keeps the world from wholly corrupting its ways."

The exclamation uttered by St. Augustin of Hippo centuries ago —"too late have I known, too late have I loved thee, beauty ever ancient and ever new!"—is recalled by a passage in one of his letters, in which he says: "I have regarded my submission to the Church as the one great blessing for which I have more reason to be grateful than for all the others put together. On the other hand, I regard as the one serious misfortune of my life that I was not a

Catholic from my early youth. If I had been one, my life would have been worth ten times as much to myself and others." Religion, poetry and patriotism—the last named in the modified form which commended itself to his conservative views—inspired all his work during the remainder of his life after his conversion, which was mainly a life of lettered ease spent in his Irish home, to which he was fondly attached, alternated with occasional appearances in society and annual pilgrimages to Wordworth's grave and to Edgbaston, and when the great Oratorios passed away to the last resting place of one who, as Mr. Ward says, had long been his most revered master in religious thought. It was at Newman's request, when an abortive attempt was made to found a genuine Catholic university in Ireland, that Aubrey de Vere accepted the chair of English literature and delivered a remarkable lecture on "Literature in Its Social Aspects," afterwards included in his published essays. "The sympathy between the two men," observes Mr. Ward, "was very close. The student of Newman will note the similarity up to a certain point of the lines of thought to be found in Aubrey's letters of 1842 and the philosophy underlying the 'University Sermons' and the 'Essay on Development'—both of them published at a later date. Direct influence, no doubt, strengthened this similarity of view in later years, though the Irish poet never had any share in the extraordinary dramatic sympathy with a critical and even with a skeptical standpoint, which was so marked a characteristic of Newman's writing. When Newman wrote 'Callista,'[1] he placed on its title page the beautiful lines on 'Reality' which Aubrey de Vere had recently published in his volume—'The Infant Bridal and Other Poems'—lines which bring out clearly one quality which they shared in common, namely, that intimate sense of communion with God which is denied to ordinary men and is the special privilege of the saints and mystics. Let the lines be here set down:

"Love thy God and love Him only,
And thy breast will ne'er be lonely.
In that one great Spirit meet
All things mighty, grave and sweet:
Vainly strives the soul to mingle
With a being of its kind;
Vainly hearts with hearts are twined;
For the deepest still is single.
An impalpable resistance.
Keeps like natures still at distance;
Mortal, love the Holy One
Or dwell for aye alone."

Newman also copied in his own handwriting from De Vere s "May Carols"—the product of three years and the outcome of the exhortation of Pius IX. to write hymns to Our Lady and the saints—the

[1] De Vere hoped that Newman would follow up "Callista" by another tale on the ultimate victory of Christianity in the Roman Empire.

two headed "In Epiphania" and "Doceus" which were appointed to be sung in the Edgbaston Oratory each day in May. The second runs thus:

He willed to lack; He willed to bear;
He willed by suffering to be schooled;
He willed the chains of flesh to wear;
Yet from her arms the world He ruled.
As tapers 'mid the noontide glow
With merged yet separate radiance burn,
With human taste and touch even so
The things He knew He willed to learn.
He sat beside the lowly door;
His homeless eyes appeared to trace
In evening skies remembered lore
And shadows of His Father's face.
One only knew Him, she alone
Who nightly to His cradle crept,
And lying like the moonbeam prone,
Worshiped her Maker as He slept.

This work, "May Carols; or, Ancilla Domini," a series of poems on the Incarnation and on devotion to Mary as its human instrument, illustrated by his favorite pictures by Giotto and Fra Angelico, Ward says, "gives probably the truest picture of Aubrey's mind in his Catholic period. The imagination is that of the ages of faith. The intellect runs on lines which produce and apply the reasonings of Coleridge, Wordsworth and Newman. There is apparent in it the devotion of a knight-errant to the Virgin Queen, and at the same time a remarkable estimate of the bearing of the position she has so long held in the minds of the faithful on Christian thought, in its relation especially to the rationalistic speculations of the middle years of the nineteenth century. . . . Mary—no mere *imaginary* ideal, but conceived as existing historically and as the historical instrument of the stupendous objective fact of the Incarnation in which Christians believe—was a standing rebuke to modern subjectivity, which, as the outcome of the denial of dogma at the Reformation, threatened to resolve Christianity into a state of emotions or a mere philosophy." In the explanatory introduction, which is marked by a depth of philosophical and theological thought that shows how he had penetrated into the inward sense of the great mystery, he develops and elucidates his thesis, showing in the descriptive poems how the whole cycle of Christian doctrine and devotion finds its centre in the single great verity insisted on by St. John, "The Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us." The idea of the "God-man" resumed all; and every year convinced him more deeply that millions of those who accept that Idea *in terms* have never the least grasped it, and that very few of those who do not accept it have ever comprehended it—or rather have ever apprehended it. "May Carols," which appeared in 1857, earned for the author the title "Laureate of Our Lady."

His pen was never idle. In 1861 he published "The Sisters" and "Innisfail," the latter followed in 1870 by "Irish Legends," both of the latter being designed to illustrate what he conceived to be the place of the Irish race in the providential plan or scheme. "To different nations," he avers, "different vocations are assigned by Providence—to me an imperial vocation, to another a commercial one; to Greece an artistic one; to Ireland, as to Israel, a spiritual one." Ireland alone among Northern nations, he held, had remained part of the spiritual polity of which Rome was the centre; it had thereby proved the thoroughness with which it had assimilated the genius of Christianity. The aim of the "Legends" he describes as the exact converse of that of the "May Carols." In the "Carols" he had endeavored to set forth the Christian religion in a philosophical form through a series of poems demonstrating the cardinal doctrine of the Incarnation in the various phases in which it presents itself to the individual intelligence. In the "Legends" he shows Christianity as a power energizing in human society and transforming it from the animal to, or at least towards, the spiritual. Those who liked the latter liked it chiefly for its delineation of character, especially St. Patrick's character. None of his poems, he declares, was written more intensely, more painfully from his heart than "Innisfail." In the introduction to it he wrote: "It has been said that Irish history abounds in touching and dramatic details, but that it is essentially fragmentary. Religion imparts a completeness to it. When religion threw off the bonds of centuries, a deliverance precious to all who sincerely respect freedom of thought and freedom of conscience, Irish history entered on its consummation, and justice won the most remarkable of her triumphs in modern times. Had it been otherwise, Irish history would have been no theme for song."

In 1864 he published "The Infant Bridal;" in 1867, "Irish Church Property and the Right Use of It," and in 1869 "Irish Odes." In the preface to the last-named volume, which consisted of poems written at various periods and not included in the writer's previous publications, he says: "The finer traits of the Irish character reveal themselves in poetry; she deals with what is beneath the surface. She makes her study not of the tavern, but of the hillside chapel and the cottage hearth without stain and faithful to the departed. She ponders the tear-blotted letter and the lip-worn rosary. In a face seldom joyless, but not seldom overcast, she finds something which makes her tread the wanderer's native land and share with him the recollections of the past."

A visit to Rome in 1870 during the holding of the Vatican Council —the year which witnessed the extinction of the Temporal Power— revived his interest in the Roman question, awakened in 1862 by

the Sardinian invasion. He valued the Papal Kingdom not for itself, but as indispensable in this imperfect material world for the independence and freedom of the spiritual power of the Papacy. Nevertheless, he earnestly favored a free Italy, the exclusion of all foreign influence from Italian affairs, and hoped for the realization of this by the formation of an Italian Confederation, in which all the component parts of Italy should be internally free and progressive. Without any fault on the part of the Popes, the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, had, in his opinion, damaged the moral position of the Holy See in Italy by establishing Austrian influence all over Italy and thereby establishing despotism. The Popes, as heads of the Guelphic party, he held, always represented both popular institutions in Italy and independence of the foreigner, and believed that the heart of Italy will come back with a remorseful love to the first asserter of Italian freedom. On the chief question, then being debated by the Council, Papal infallibility, he had an open mind, leaning rather to the "definitionist" side, feeling convinced that the Council would leave, as it has left, vast and most useful results behind it. Year by year he marked the progress of events in Rome by sonnets collected later on and published under the title of "St. Peter's Chains," in which he expressed the view that the Church in communion with the Apostolic See could alone ultimately guard Christianity from the agnostic tendency of modern free thought. He considered that in the long run Papal independence would mean freedom for religion; and religion must be free in order to be the effective safeguard of social order. The downfall of Papal independence would mean the final destruction of the Christendom which had so long represented corporate faith in Christianity. He greeted with approval Montalembert's saying, that the spiritual and temporal authority must be combined in Rome, that they may safely be separated elsewhere. At the same time he was careful to dissociate himself from the "impossible crusade," to give back to the Pope the old States of the Church, to restore exactly the *status quo* before 1870. True independence, he contended, must be won for the Papacy, but in such form and by such means as are best suited to new conditions. His great desire was to arouse public opinion from apathy on the subject to a sense that modern anarchy and Socialism would eventually triumph if the Papacy, the great historic guardian of the principles of order and authority, did finally lose its effective freedom. The victory of the anti-clerical fanatics, who treat freedom of religion as unimportant, would mean the victory of a principle of anarchy. The object of "St. Peter's Chains," he wrote to Mr. Ward in 1888, was "to attract the attention of Catholics to an enormous and most dangerous scandal and opprobrium, which can

only be arrested by the creation of a sounder public opinion, or rather Christian philosophy, than now prevails in lands nominally Christian and even Catholic. If Catholics," he declared, "remain apathetic on that subject, they cannot expect that Protestants will rise again even to such an appreciation of it as they possessed twenty years ago."

In 1874 he brought out his political drama, "Alexander the Great," the success of which encouraged him two years later to follow it up with "St. Thomas of Canterbury," the poems being intended as a dramatic contrast and a study of the philosophy of history. The first thing Tennyson said to him when they met was, "So I hear you have taken 'Becket' out of my hands." Lord Emly thought it his best work, but Patmore judged differently.

"Legends of the Saxon Saints" was a study of Saxon England at the time of its conversion to Christianity by the Benedictine monks who accompanied St. Augustin, the North and Scotland having already been evangelized by Irish missioners. Döllinger, who ascribes the foundation of many of the English sees to Irishmen, says: "These holy men served God and not the world; they possessed neither gold nor silver, and all that they received from the rich passed through their hands into the hands of the poor."

In 1881 he made an incursion into the political arena with a pamphlet on "Constitutional and Unconstitutional Actions," but the next year applied his mind and his pen to a more congenial theme in "The Foray of Queen Meav and Other Legends of Ireland's Heroic Age." In 1887 appeared "Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire," followed by "Mediæval Records and Sonnets," both of which relate to the gradual permeation of Christian ideals and beliefs throughout the civilization of the Western nations and the subsequent partial realization of a Christian polity. Like Châteaubriand, he strove to impress upon his readers the world's indebtedness to Christianity, both in what it possesses and takes for granted, without recognizing its original source and in what it has ceased to appreciate and has lost through callousness; for high moral ideals, he contended, could be lost by an age just as artistic or literary taste may become depraved. He was enamored of the middle ages, or ages of faith, and averred that they still survive among us more than we know in their instincts of honor and affection. "The descendants of those who built our cathedrals," he observes, "could see nothing in Gothic architecture; and there was a time when Dante and Shakespeare scarcely survived except as names. We still make our boast of Columbus and Corpernicus; but we sometimes forget that these were mediæval men and men specially imbued with the mediæval spirit." That spirit was an

emanation of a living faith. "To the mediæval mind," he says, "life was a deep thing. To it the Divine was ever glancing forth from things which to the 'mind of the sense' seemed but trifles. To deal kindly with a leper was to clothe and feed a God. To scandalize one of Christ's 'little ones' might be to forfeit a deathless inheritance. Earth was then regarded as an exile, not a 'patria.' To the Christian the great things were the invisible things; but from this it followed that the Christian 'moved about in worlds not realized' by the senses, that they might be the better realized by the soul. Such worlds must have been phantom worlds but for those three angels of man's life, Faith, Hope and Charity, which moved among them and irradiated them."

"The Death of Copernicus," which he published in the *Contemporary Review* in 1889, was an attempt to foreshadow that blending of science with Christian faith which he regarded as the one hope for the future of civilization. "Proteus and Amadeus," a selection of his poems, appeared in 1890, and three years later "Religious Problems of the Nineteenth Century." His "Recollections," published in 1897, closed his literary career.

Besides his published writings, he carried on a voluminous correspondence with a wide circle of literary friends, some of his letters, full of ripe thought, reading like finished essays. It drew him into politics, particularly Irish politics, during the stormy times of the Land League, when political passions on both sides were at white heat. He took the unpopular side, to the real or fancied detriment of his literary labors, and his reputation suffered an eclipse, so far at least as it could be gauged from publishers' sales-books—an uncertain standard at all times. But the Irish public just then were too busy with too many burning questions to devote any attention to literature even tinged with local color and of a national flavor. Writing to an American correspondent, Professor Norton, who, though not a Catholic, fully shared his views on the middle ages, he wrote:

"How pleasant must be those quiet yet active evenings you pass in literary labors with your friends, Mr. Lowell and Mr. Longfellow! I assure you your description of them made me wish very much indeed that I could form one of that circle. Literary labor, with the hope of a result, must be a very animating thing! For a great many years I have never written anything in prose or verse without the knowledge that, on account of jealousies and animosities, either political or polemical, what I wrote was in fact but a letter to some few friends, known and unknown, to be illustrated by a good deal of abuse and recalled to my recollection by the printers' bill. I am on the unpopular side, you know, in England

because I am a Catholic, and in Ireland because I am opposed to revolutionary schemes."

The very keen interest taken in his poetry by a group of American friends, Mr. Ward says, was evidently a great pleasure to Aubrey de Vere in his last years. Many private letters and able reviews in the American papers, showing very high and discriminating appreciation of its purpose and merits, reached him during the last decade of his life. "This encourages me to hope," he wrote to an American admirer in 1895, "that my verse may yet do more of good than I should have thought likely."

The strife and turmoil of political agitation were foreign to the tranquil spirit and meditative mind of De Vere, who looked upon the modern world with the eyes of a mediæval ascetic. He dreamed of an Ireland, to him essentially a nation with a spiritual mission, transformed by righteous legislation into "the La Vendée of the Empire," and bemoaned the shortsightedness of contemporary British statesmen, whom he did not admire as much as they admired themselves and whom he charged with having produced the chief dangers of the time. But in the 80's of the last century Ireland was thoroughly aroused and terribly in earnest, led by a masterful man who personified and pleaded the cause of an ancient race resolved to achieve its legislative freedom and to remove the greatest obstacle to its acquisition. It was not to be soothed to sleep like a restless child—although Disraeli in one of his novels describes Irish sedition as "a child talking in its sleep"—or thrown into a state of political coma by the administration of such mild legislative opiates as De Vere, in his innocent optimism, would prescribe. His diagnosis was inaccurate. Poetry, not politics, was his forte. He failed to grasp and gauge the situation; failed to see that Irish landlordism, as it had existed for centuries, was doomed to extinction. It had held its Belshazzar's feast and could not see or interpret the handwriting on the wall. De Vere recoiled from revolutionary methods of redress; but every great organic change is essentially revolutionary. A revolution is now in peaceful progress in crimeless Ireland.[2] The transfer of the greater portion of the soil of Ireland from the landlords to the tillers of that soil by an orderly legal process, to which British credit is being pledged to the extent of many millions, is a revolution in itself. Coupled with the substitution of County Councils, elected on a popular franchise, for nominated grand juries, in which the landlords were supreme, and with restored autonomy

[2] During the spring Assizes of 1909 in twenty-five cities and counties the Irish Judges commented on the peaceful state of each district of the country. In Limerick and Wicklow they were presented with white gloves, as there were no criminal cases.

within measurable distance we are witnessing the evolution of a New Ireland—a democratic Ireland, not a royalist La Vendée.

What De Vere dreaded still more was "the rapid Jacobinizing of a people till lately perhaps the most Catholic in Europe, a catastrophe," he says, "which I have long looked upon as among the possibilities, and as a thing far worse than the restoration of the penal laws would be." His fears were chimerical. If at any time there was a danger of Jacobinism or anti-clericalism gaining a hold upon Ireland, it was averted by the united action of the majority of the Irish Bishops, particularly by the dominant influence of Dr. Croke, Archbishop of Cashel—a vigorous prelate, cast in the masculine mould of a Doyle or a Ketteler—who took a bold line and pursued it fearlessly and unflinchingly despite obloquy, misrepresentation and misunderstanding.

After his last pilgrimage in 1898 to the tombs of Wordsworth and Newman—the two great souls who impressed him most, for whom, he said himself, his love had been most like idolatry—he spent the closing years of his long life in Ireland. His correspondence and the recollections of friends and relatives during those years give a picture of the evening of his life, passed in religious peace, full of tender memories of old days, a devotion to the interests of the Church and his country, of sympathy for those he loved, of the desire to make them share, as far as possible, in the beliefs and hopes which were so much to himself, yet ever choosing, with the tact of the heart, those thoughts which he knew to be within the store of each friend to whom he wrote. "It was," says Mr. Ward,[3] "truly a gracious sunset, after a long summer's day, as he moved onwards

> "In kindly curves, with gentlest fall,
> By quiet fields, a slowly dying power,
> To that last deep where we and thou are still."

Religion, never absent from his mind, took complete possession of his thoughts as the end drew near, theology displacing poetry. "As I approach the close of earthly life," he wrote to Miss Norton, "every year makes me feel more that the one great source both of happiness and of peace in our declining years was intended to be authentic Christianity, as distinguished from the imitations of it set up by men who fancy that they make it more easy of acceptance by cutting it down, and divesting it of those high mysteries which alone give it power and reality—mysteries which no authentic religion could ever have been without, when propounded to our limited faculties, and none of them really more mysterious than the very first principles of theism or of morals."

[3] Op. cit., p. 375.

Besides his portraits we have pen-pictures of him seated in his library where his father had sat, read and wrote, or wearing a skull-cap as he took his walks in the grounds of Curragh Chase, reading the Psalms from his mother's Bible or reciting the breviary, as was customary among devout Catholics in the middle ages he loved and copied. Mr. Edmund Gosse describes him as having "an ecclesiastical air like that of some highly cultivated, imaginative old abbé." His friends called him "the Orb," and were wont to say that his feet alone touched the earth, the rest of him being already in heaven. Mrs. Monsell says of him, when he was seventy-four: "Our feeling after a few weeks of daily intercourse came to be that he was veritably a 'saint.'" When Mr. Gosse saw him at eighty-three his countenance bore a singular resemblance to the portraits of Wordsworth, although the type was softer and less vigorous. His forehead, which sloped a little, was high and domed; in his case truly,

> The dome of thought, the palace of the soul.

He was a brilliant conversationalist. Gosse says, "He was, in fact, conversation made visible." When eighty-four he would talk for three hours with no other interruption than brief pauses for reflection and without the smallest sign of fatigue. "The astonishing fullness of his memory," observes the writer just quoted, "made his conversation marvelous and delightful. He not merely passed with complete comprehension of the relative distance from events of 1820 to events of to-day, but his verbal memory was astounding." At that advanced age he still remembered substantially the bulk of the writings of Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats and other favorite poets.

Miss Helen Smith, sister of Professor Walter George Smith, of Philadelphia—a member of the University of Pennsylvania and at one time president of the American Historical Society—who met him one summer afternoon in London in 1897, says, "He brought an atmosphere of genial light and gladness with him. We are very apt to associate sadness with age, or at least a look of settled gravity and habitual care. In the presence of Aubrey de Vere there is the vigorous freshness of morning; or else his is one of those rare evenings of life when the sky is lighted to the very zenith with the glow of the sunset. His eyes are clear and bright, kindling as he speaks with rare enthusiasm; he has a keen sense of humor, the gift of all Irishmen, and at the same time a calm, dignified presence. . . . He told us of the tomb of his ancestors, the 'fighting Veres, in Westminster Abbey.' . . . He dined that night with us, a stately figure in his velvet coat, and with that gentle courtesy of manner which seems also to have passed away with much else that

belonged to a former time. . . . Our parting that night was to be the last, for we were leaving London the next day, and indeed in a few weeks would be returning to America, so that with the hope of meeting him again was mingled the fear that, at his great age, this hope was slight. Ours is a lovely remembrance of the gentle poet, in his serene age, looking out on the world with undimmed vision, keeping the generous impulse of youth joined to the certain wisdom of maturity with a faith that in its entire simplicity is like the inexpressible faith of a child, pure, radiant, calm, a jewel kept inviolate by reverent hands. As he stood at the door for a final adieu he turned his clear gaze on us and said, 'When you go back to America write to me, and if I am not here when you return to England, pray for me.' "

He was not there when they returned. He had already joined the *turba magna,* singing the praises of God and Our Lady in heaven, after singing them so long on earth in melodious verse. The end was as pious and peaceful as his life had been. He was in his usual health up to January 12, 1902, two days after his eighty-eighth birthday. On that day he went to Mass at Adare in an open carriage. He caught a chill and became seriously ill on Tuesday, the 14th. Even in his wanderings he was constantly praying for his friends, "holy and saint-like," wrote his niece, Mrs. De Vere, "in his death, as in life." His old friend, Dean Flanagan, who used to visit him once a month, stay over night and give him Communion in the morning, gave him now the last sacraments and was often with him to the close. He remained unconscious, hovering between life and death for a few days, until, at half-past seven on the morning of the 21st, he passed to his eternal rest.

If as a poet Aubrey de Vere did not scale the topmost heights of Parnassus; if he did not take such a large grasp of the reading public as other writers and was not so widely read and so often quoted; if he was not, like Moore, "the poet of all circles," he was at least "the idol of his own." His circle was a select and appreciative one. It included poets like Wordsworth and Tennyson, who like himself, wedded poety to high ideals. It was no small tribute to his worth and work to have won the applause of such masters of the literary craft. But De Vere did not ambition being a poet for the mere sake of literary reputation. With him it was not an end, but a means to an end. He made it a vehicle for the expression and diffusion of Catholic thought on the philosophy of history and on all the great problems linked with the progress of Christian civilization, drawing his inspiration from Catholic theology, which attracted him as it has always attracted all really deep thinkers. "My aim in most of my poetry," he wrote to an American admirer,

"was chiefly to illustrate not nature, but the supernatural in the form of supernatural truth, and the supernaturalized affections that have their root in a supernaturalized humanity—not so much a humanity unfallen as a humanity redeemed. I wished also to illustrate that humanity in its relations with our fallen humanity by recording the conversion of two very different nations, viz., Ireland and England, and also to record some of the conflicts of nature and grace as well as their harmonies during the two chief periods of the world, viz., that from the fate of the Roman Empire to the time of Charlemagne, and subsequently through the great mediæeval period to the beginning of the modern time, still in its rude boyhood, but destined to resume all that preceded it, in common with progressive science and freedom, which will prove gifts or curses, according as they subject themselves to Christian truth and love, or revolt against these."

Mr. Ward assigns to him a place in literature similar to that of the brilliant group of Frenchmen and women whose names are associated with the *correspondant*—Montalembert, Lacordaire, Madame Pauline Craven and their co-workers, who were striving in France to bring home in a form persuasive to their generation the beauty of the Christianity with which the world appeared to be likely parting. It was this mental attitude which continually fixed his thoughts on what are called "the ages of faith," particularly the epoch of St. Francis and St. Dominic, when the mendicant orders were remoulding and influencing Catholic thought in religion, literature and art. "If we have again as great an age as the thirteenth century, with all its limitations, was," he wrote to Professor Norton, "that must prove an age greater yet, and doubtless we may be on the way to it—in which case we shall have nobler buildings than the world then erected, for there will be nobler things demanding expression." From his viewpoint the present and the future are linked with the past. To him the middle ages was not a closed volume, to be occasionally reopened and perused with a kind of antiquarian interest, but as throwing light on the "one increasing purpose" which runs through all the history of humanity ever since the Incarnation.

R. F. O'Connor.

Dublin, Ireland.

HISTORY OF HUMAN HABITATIONS.

IF "the proper study of mankind is man," it may be well for us to devote a few moments to the study of man's manners and customs and to take a cursory glance at his inner life. From the time of his expulsion from Eden we find him conscious of the need of a habitation. He sought protection against the elements, against the attacks of wild beasts and against the avarice of his fellow-men. In prehistoric times, when his ideas of construction were very limited and the only tools in his possession were of the rudest stone, horn and bone, we find him seeking shelter under cliffs and in caves, after the manner of the wild beasts against which he sought protection.

Nor was he content with making these caves simply his place of habitation; they became his refuge in times of danger and his resting-place after death. Thus we find that Lot dwelt in a cave; that the five Canaanite Kings who fled from Joshua, and David who fled from Saul, found refuge in the caves of Palestine, and that the cave of Adullam was such a refuge for the oppressed that its name became proverbial. So, too, the caves of Auvergne offered protection to the Aquitani when pursued by their Roman invaders.

At a Paris exposition, which we had the good fortune to attend, M. Charles Garnier, the well-known French architect, exhibited some thirty-nine buildings, the typical homes of ages long since past. This intensely interesting and instructive collection of human habitations has awakened a new interest in the origin, growth and development of the homes of men.

Th troglodytes, or cave-dwellers, of what is known as the Paleolithic or Drift Period revealed some very interesting facts to the archæologist. The comparatively recent researches of such men as M. Larlet, of France, and Mr. Christy, of England, have not only shown the coexistence of man with extinct mammalia, but have afforded a clew to the races that so existed. The exploration of the floors of these primitive human habitations have revealed broken bones of animals killed in the chase, numbers of rude implements and weapons of bone and unpolished stone, while the charcoal and burnt stones have clearly indicated the position of the hearths. Flakes, awls, spearheads, hammers and saws made of flint are to be found mingled with bone needles, carved reindeer antlers, arrowheads and bones of reindeer, horse, ibex, etc.

The reindeer must have formed the chief article of food, and enormous herds of these animals must have existed in France in those days. Nor were these the only animals that fell a prey to

the hunters, for remains of the cave-bear and of the lion have been found in one cave and of the mammoth in five others. Professor W. Boyd Dawkins, of Owens College, Manchester, England, describes some very remarkable specimens of carved deer antlers and of figures cut in fragments of schist and on ivory. "A well-defined figure of an ox stands out boldly from one piece of antler, but the most striking figure is that of a mammoth engraved on a fragment of its own tusk." The peculiar spiral curvature of the tusk and the long mane, which are now no longer found in any living elephant, show that the original was familiar to the eye of the artist. This would seem to prove conclusively that the ancient cave-dwellers of Aquitaine lived by hunting and fishing, and that they were clad with the skins of animals sewed together with sinews or strips of intestines.

It may be of interest to the American reader to have his attention called to the fact that bone needles, flint spearheads, arrowheads and scrapers of precisely the same form as those described are still in use among the Esquimaux. The plan and workmanship of the artistic designs found in the cave habitations of France, Belgium and Switzerland are identical with those of the Esquimaux, except that the hunting scenes vary with the animals known to each race of people.

Caves are used as human habitations to this day. There are numerous caves formed into dwelling places in which the gypsies of Spain have lived from time immemorial, and in Southern Italy accidental excavations have been in like manner adapted for use. Who will say that upon examination even these might not reveal some signs of their having served as homes to prehistoric men?

We now pass to another form of habitation. These are supposed to have commenced at the close of the Stone Age and to have extended well into the Bronze Age, and are known as the Lacustrine villages, or Lake Dwellings. As their name implies, they are habitations constructed not on the dry land, but at some distance from the shore, on lakes or rivers. It was the custom to select a sunny shore protected as much as possible from storms and having a lake bottom of a soft and sandy nature. Here they drove in piles that had been cut down in the forests, sharpened either by fire or stone axes, and driven into their places by the use of heavy stone mallets. When properly adjusted, these poles were leveled off at a certain distance above the water and a platform of boards was fastened on with pegs. On the platforms thus made were built huts, probably square or oblong in shape, and not more than twenty-five feet in length. They were adapted for a single family and were generally supplied with a hearthstone and a grain-crusher in each.

The huts were made of twigs or branches of trees filled in with clay. Stalls were in some cases provided for the cattle and a bridge of from ten or twelve to so much as a hundred yards in length led back to the mainland. Over this bridge the cattle were driven back and forth. The dwellers of these habitations were probably engaged in the various occupations of fishing, hunting, agriculture and the tending of cattle. It will not be difficult to understand that structures like these must have been very much exposed to danger from fire, and many have been destroyed in this way. But what was thus a loss to the owner became of great value to the archæologist of modern times. Many of the things that were partly burned before falling into the lake were made impervious by the coating of charcoal found around them to the corroding influence of the water. In this manner have been preserved the very grain itself and their loaves or cakes of crushed meal. These grains were of various kinds, such as wheat, oats, barley, etc.

There is nothing that would lead us to suppose that these lake-dwellers were of a warlike character, and as regards the arts of peace, they were considerably in advance of the men of the tumuli. The specimens of woven textures, sometimes worked with simple but not inartistic patterns, command admiration. To agriculture they added gardening and the cultivation of fruit trees. They seem to have lived in the simplest and narrowest form of village community and to have been believers in social equality, as there is no record of any hut on these islands having been larger, better supplied or better cared for than the rest. It is calculated by some writers that the custom of erecting lake habitations prevailed for at least two thousand years among the people who lived in the vicinity of the Swiss lakes and those of Northern Italy, Austria, Hungary, Mecklenburg and Pomerania. Hippocrates, writing in the fifth century B. C., says of the people of Phasis that as their country was hot and marshy and subject to frequent inundations, they lived in "houses of timber and reeds constructed in the midst of waters and used boats made of a single tree-trunk." Herodotus, writing in the same century, describes the people of Lake Prasias as "living in houses constructed on platforms supported on piles in the middle of the lake, and which are approached from the land by a single narrow bridge."

Lake-dwellings are quite prevalent in South America. They are to be seen in the Gulf of Maracaibo and in the estuaries of the Orinoco and the Amazon. Indeed, it was the prevalence of these lake-dwellings along its shores that, as is well known, gave the name of Venezuela, or Little Venice, to the province of that name. Similar dwellings are to be found among the dykes of Borneo, in Celebes,

in the Caroline Islands, on the Gold Coast of Africa and elsewhere.

In M. Garnier's collection, above alluded to, he gives a specimen of Jewish architecture, or rather of a Jewish dwelling of 1000 B. C. These buildings would seem to indicate the use of stone or dried brick. The habitations of the better classes were built with interior courts and embellished with fountains and gardens. The long sojourn of the Jews in Egypt and the fact that their chief employment while there was the manufacture of bricks would seem to explain their familiarity with this kind of building material. When the Israelites conquered Canaan they took possession of the dwellings of the people they had vanquished, and we have no record of any important buildings erected by them until the time of Solomon; but even in his time the Jews had not yet learned how to hew timber properly, for Solomon himself admits that "there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like unto the Sidonians."

If we would seek the beginnings of art, its earliest efforts, which command admiration, even in their rudest state, we must go to the Egyptians, who have given us, in all probability, the oldest specimens of architecture in the world. Herodotus tells us that the oldest works of the Egyptians were the embankment of the Nile by Menes, the foundation of the city of Memphis and the commencement of the Temple of Vulcan. It would take volumes to dwell at any length upon the general architecture of the Egyptians. What we are most interested in at present is their private dwellings, and, unfortunately, in this direction there is little to be learned. From wall-paintings we can get some ideas of the interiors of well-to-do private houses. They show the plans of dwellings and adjoining vegetable and flower gardens so well that we can distinguish even the very products. But, notwithstanding the fact that these plans designate separate rooms and their entrances, it is still difficult to arrive at any definite idea of the general arrangement of a normal house or its exterior appearance. The views of interiors, with their slender columns and narrow entrances, present a system of perspectives which show things above one another instead of behind one another. Ordinary dwellings seem to have been two stories high, with an open balcony or gallery at the top supported by columns, and from the absence of any remains of these supports, it is reasonable to suppose that they were of wood. The larger houses are supposed to have consisted of rooms ranged around three sides and sometimes four of a large courtyard planted with trees and with perhaps a fountain in the centre, very much after the manner of the habitations used in the West Indies at the present day.

The habitations of the Kings of Assyria have been described over and over again (notably in the April issue of this "Review").

In architecture they are entirely unlike those of Egypt. Here no forest of columns, no grand pylons, no magnificent cloistered courts or gigantic pyramids strike the eye. The sphinx is superseded by the winged bull and the slightly cut intaglio by the magnificently sculptured slab. In the early Assyrian structures there is art at a high state of perfection, but we have little or no means of discovering the steps by which it was attained.

Private dwellings, which were not, like the royal chambers, constructed with hewn and sculptured stones as a revetment of the weak masonry of unburnt bricks, are now in such a complete state of ruin as to make it almost impossible to obtain a clear conception of the original form. The reliefs known to us are hardly sufficient to convey any satisfactory information in regard to them. Among the clearest of these is a relief of Kouyunjik, which shows buildings with hemispherical and oval cupolas very much like those still to be found in some parts of Syria. The openings for light and air are distinctly visible on the summit of the vaults. On the other hand, the Assyrians had a sort of tent-like dwellings, which are often to be found in large numbers enclosed by fortification walls. Ordinarily private houses are represented on some of the slabs as being several stories in height and the ground floor as having but one door and no windows. All had flat roofs made of thick layers of earth on strong beams and were almost fireproof.

One of the most interesting specimens of human habitations the writer has ever seen is one given at the exposition above referred to by M. Garnier of an Etruscan dwelling. The Etruscans had long passed their highest point of perfection at the time when Hellenic influence had developed to its fullest extent in Magna Græcia. Roman traditions attest to their civilization in its artistic as well as in its political aspects. Their mode of living was very much like that of the Romans. One of the principal features of the Etruscan or primitive Italian dwelling-house was the inner court. As in Grecian architecture, this formed the central point, the chief space of the dwelling, around which were grouped the ceiled chambers subordinate in dimensions and importance. The court, being intended as the place for the usual family gathering, a partial covering could not have sufficed in these northern Apenines, as would have been the case in Rome or Naples or Pompeii, where continuous rain, snow and winter frosts were not prevalent at certain seasons of the year. The central opening was smaller and thus excluded the effects of storm and cold. The Italian atrium or cavædium thus acquired a different form from that of the Grecian court and was noted for the entire absence of columns as well as by the outward inclination of the roof. This latter peculiarity had

the advantage that, notwithstanding the diminution of the central aperture, more light was admitted, the slanting rays of the sun falling high upon the walls, while, on the other hand, the interior of the house was free from the objectionable raindrops, and by covering the opening in bad weather or at night, could be entirely isolated and protected.

The Persians, like the Assyrians, seem to have devoted all their architectural tastes and talents to temples and tombs, many of which are well known to the student of history. Notably among these is the tomb of Cyrus, which has been preserved almost intact in its architectural bearings. Little is known, however, of their domestic architecture. No vestiges of private houses have been found which belong to a period prior to that of the Roman Emperors. It is evident that the habitations of the subjects were not in any manner to be compared in style or splendor to the palaces of their despotic rulers, and they must have been built of the most perishable materials. The Persian house, while it may have borne some resemblance in plan and arrangement to the dwellings of the nobility, was, of course, greatly modified by the substitution of an open court for the hypostyle hall, by the omission of terraces, columns and carvings, and by the reduction of all space to a minimum. The houses of the better classes, of course, rarely failed to be surmounted by a dome, generally of polished brick.

The civilization of the ancient Phœnicians and their energy and progressiveness, have been the theme of many a college graduate as well as of many a distinguished writer. We know that they were noted for their push, and that they carried their knowledge of certain sciences not only into adjacent, but to remote countries as well. But how did they live? What knowledge had they of architecture? M. Garnier's specimen shows that they were acquainted with the use of columns, capitals and galleries. This knowledge they made use of in the construction of the houses of the wealthier classes, so that many of them possessed not a few of the attractions of more modern buildings. Their structures were durable. The materials employed by the Pœnician architects seem generally to have been the cedars of Lebanon and the various metals of transmarine commerce. Of the remains of the earlier specimens of their domestic architecture may be mentioned an entirely unornamented house hewed from the rock of Amrith and a portal at Um-el-Aumid, where the central block of the tripel lintel is decorated with the Egyptian disk and serpents upon either side.

Hindoo architecture has been divided into that of the Aryan and Sanscrit races of North India, that of the South, or of the Tamul races, and that prevalent in the Punjab and Cashmere. Of the

first and last we have comparatively little knowledge, but South Hindoo work is treated by Ram Raz, a native author, who tells us that many treatises on architecture existed in India. Recent researches have thrown considerable light upon the history of architecture in the East. The rock-cut temples and caves of Ellora are too well known to require any description here. The Pagoda forms a very prominent feature in the architecture of Farther India. Modern Serinagur (the ancient name of the capital of Cashmere and resumed in 1819) has the appearance of a city of chalets, and has not materially changed since the seventeenth century. Although stone is by no means scarce in that country, the inhabitants, as in times gone by, still find their building material in the cedar woods which abound upon the neighboring hillsides, and which can be obtained at little cost, because of its ready transportation on rafts. Viewed from the lake, Serinagur delights the eye by the capricious irregularity of the dwellings along the shore, some being built over the water, on piles, while others are almost buried in the surrounding verdure. The more humble dwellings, too, with their thatched and boarded roofs, suggestive of the Jura, are truly picturesque.

Of the many beautiful gardens to be found in this vicinity, the best preserved is the Schalamar Bagh, situated at the base of an amphitheatre of wooded heights rising gradually to an elevation of some 14,000 feet, between the valleys of Jhelam and Scind, and overtopped by one of the most picturesque mountains in Cashmere. It was the work of the unfortunate Shah Jehan, father and victim of Aureng Zeb, and was splendidly laid out. It was traversed by a grand canal bordered with greensward and rows of beautiful poplars. This led to a large bungalow in the centre of the garden. Here was another canal, far more beautiful, leading to the extremity of the enclosure. Along the banks were numerous fountains and jets playing in the sunlight. It terminated at another bungalow more beautiful than the first, quadrangular in form and surmounted by a dome. It consisted of a central building and four smaller ones at the corners, all ornamented with gildings and inscriptions. There were four doors, two of which opened upon a noble flight of steps leading into a canal, and the other two opening upon bridges that spanned the canal and were connected with the avenues. On every-hand might be seen columns of a black and gray marble, supposed to have been brought from an ancient Hindoo temple destroyed by Shah Jehan.

We now come to make a hurried study of the homes of the Greeks. As no nation has ever equaled the Egyptians in the extent and magnitude of their architectural monuments, neither have

the Greeks ever been surpassed in the exquisite beauty of form and proportion, in the extreme simplicity and perfect harmony, which pervade every detail in their structures. Unfortunately their monuments are known to us only in their ruins, for there is not a perfect Grecian building in existence to-day. Then, too, the origin of Greek architecture, like the origin of every art and science of that country, is intermingled with mythical and fabulous history. Each of its three styles has its peculiar mythical birth. Thus, the Doric is said to have been copied from the early wooden huts of the aborigines; the Ionic, which sprang up among the Greek colonists in Asia Minor, to have been modeled upon the graceful proportions of the female figure, as the Doric had been upon the more robust form of man; the volutes (or spiral scroll appended on each side of the capital of the Ionic order) representing the curls of the hair; the fluting, the folds of the drapery, etc. The story of the origin of the Corinthian style is very pretty, and, though well known, may not be out of place here. A nurse had put in a basket on the grave of a departed child, the toys it had played with in life. The basket was placed accidentally on the root of an acanthus, and in the spring, when the leaves grew, they curled gracefully around the basket, and under a flat stone which had been laid on the top of it Callimachus, the sculptor, caught up the idea and worked out, at Corinth, the beautiful capital since called after that city. Modern discoveries, however, show that Greece owed much to the earlier civilization of the countries which preceded it in history. The private dwellings of Greece stood in no relation to its monumental public buildings; and the fact that no remains exist of the domestic structures of the Greeks is a proof that these were of the same subordinate importance as was the family in the Hellenic State. The house was nothing more than the scene of the family labors, and turned modestly inward, confined and simple chambers being grouped around a central court. The life of the Greek was, for the most part, spent away from home, upon the market-place and in the gymnasia and stoas. It was only at meal-time and for repose that he sought his home. This was completely separated from the outer world, the dwelling-rooms having no windows upon the street and the façade being unimportant. The rooms, with the exception of the dining-hall, were but little developed and were lighted through the door alone. Their windowless walls presented no opportunity for architectural treatment, this being restricted to the court, which was a space of considerable size and surrounded by a colonnade. For centuries there was nothing to lead to any change in this simple dwelling or to the development of a palace architecture. In the days of heroes and tyrants the constructive

ability was insufficient, and the subsequent republican equality was opposed to all individual display. It was not until the royal power had, in the Macedonian period, taken the place of democracy, that private architecture made any decided advance.

The Roman dwelling houses, although in their earliest ages identical with those of the Etruscans, were built on a scale of greater magnificence than those of the Greeks. Everything appears to have been directed to internal splendor and effect only; and, indeed, all collateral evidence tends to show that the exterior of Roman palaces and habitations was a matter of little importance, as they were merely plain brick walls. The Roman palaces of to-day have little to recommend them architecturally to the beholder; but the interiors have always commanded admiration. It is true that they were very different from the houses of the present day, both in style of architecture and what we call "home comforts." The entrance hall, called the ostium, was often paved with mosaic. The atrium was the inner court, or hall, the sitting-room of the family, and often, in the houses of the humbler classes, the kitchen. In the centre was the impluvium, or tank of water. Small rooms at the right and left of the atrium were called the atæ or wings. The triclinium, or dining-room, had couches on which the guests reclined, and a central table. The family records and archives were kept in a recess, or room, called the tablinum, and the beautiful court, open to the sky and often surrounded by columns and statues, was the peristytium. In the centre was the viridarium, or garden, and the rooms for social purposes were the exedra and æcus.

It may not be out of place in this connection, to say a word about the cost of living. In Cicero's day a laborer lived on forty dollars a year, and under Augustus the yearly maintenance of a slave was fifty-seven dollars and fifty cents, or a little more than ten cents a day. The fare of the rich was as sumptuous as that of the poor was humble. Thousands of dollars were spent on costly dishes, while flowers, perfumes, ointments and dress swallowed up millions every year. We learn from Pliny that Cicero's friend, the tragedian Æsopus, paid over $4,000 for a single dish of singing birds; and from Seneca that M. Gavius Apicius, the prince of Roman gourmands, after spending $4,000,000 on the pleasures of the table, took poison because, having only $400,000 left, he saw starvation staring him in the face. When private citizens—nay, even an actor—spent thousands of dollars, it is fair to infer that vast sums were invested in their importation and sale.

It is in the early Roman basilicas and churches, some of which are of the time of Constantine, and which were constructed in the

Roman style, that we begin to notice certain divergencies which increased in the process of time, until they developed into a new style, having peculiarities of its own, but even more clearly deducible from its origin than Roman is from Greek, or Greek from Egyptian. There was one important modification of Roman art brought about by contact with the East which soon became known as Byzantine. This influence was made manifest and very strongly, too, in St. Mark's Cathedral, Venice, which is entirely Byzantine in style, as opposed to Romanesque. From Venice it went to Perigueux, France, to the Church of St. Front, and this copy influenced the style of a large number of churches in the south of France. But the finest example of the Byzantine style is the Mosque of St. Sophia (the Church of Divine Wisdom) in Constantinople. It soon spread to Russia, and some of the most beautiful churches in that country, notably the Church of the Blessed Virgin, in the Kremlin, belong to that order.

Private dwellings throughout the country were, almost without exception, built of wood, and even in the large cities there were no houses of stone until the middle of the fifteenth century, when Western customs were beginning to be introduced into Moscow. The architectural forms determined by a timbered construction admit of so little variation that the modern houses of he Alps and Russia are strikingly similar in general appearance.

The unity of plan and architectural forms observable throughout Germany, in spite of provincial differences, was as little to be found in the twelfth century in France as in Italy. The native Celts and Gauls remained prominent only in the west of France, and so many and such different foreign elements were introduced into the other districts that no regular and settled architectural types could be developed. The dwellings of the primitive Gauls were not unlike those of the Romans of the same period. Their habitations were more huts than houses, being circular in form, the supports resting upon enormous stones and the oval roof they sustained being of straw. After the Roman invasion, the Gauls gradually adopted the civilization of their conquerors and their dwelling places became more pretentious.

The dwellings of the Arabs or Mahommedans are very interesting in their way, and yet there are but few remains of their civic and domestic architecture in Egypt which can with certainty be referred to the earliest epoch. But it may be inferred that the style employed in structures of this class, after having been once fully developed, was but little altered during later centuries, so that the general character of the dwellings and public buildings of the first century after their occupation may, perhaps, be understood from a

study of the examples of this kind still erected in the country of the Mahommedans. The exterior of private houses was plain and uninviting. The portal was, in some instances, richly decorated, but always calculated to resist forcible intrusion. In the lower stories the windows were small and irregularly distributed, but above this they were broad and airy, and supplied with projecting lattice-work, which took the place of the Italian and Spanish balconies and the oriel-windows of the North. The dwelling-rooms all opened toward a large inner court, which was rendered extremely picturesque by colonnades and fantastic arcades, by pavements of colored marbles or of glazed tiles, by fountains and by the woven draperies of the doors and windows. A dais of masonry took the place of furniture in the sleeping and living rooms. The Arabians have always had great veneration for water. Even in private houses the surroundings of this life-giving element are often magnificently adorned, while the decorations of the public fountains are really elaborate, as, for instance, the well-known Fountain of Abderrahman.

To attempt a description of the habitations of men in their many varieties and their geographical distribution would take us far beyond the limits of a magazine article and furnish ample matter for a large and intensely interesting volume.

We have seen that the form of man's living abode has almost inevitably been the model for the resting place of his dead. As the former has been primordially either caves burrowed in the earth or the crevices of rocks, so the tombs have been originally excavations. The dwelling places of the dead have also exerted a greater influence upon the construction of human habitations than many of us are aware of. We know, too, that the tomb at times has been made to resemble in its structural form at least the chambers of the living. It was dug out, and sometimes walled in, and generally covered with a mound of earth, not only for protection, but to conceal the relics it was customary in times gone by to inter with the dead. That this custom prevailed to a very great extent is simply attested by the countless tumili to be found not only in India and Ireland, but likewise along the banks of the Ohio and the Mississippi. From the shores of Lake Erie, where they are scarcely discernible, these tumuli gradually increase in size until they rise to the colossal heights of the pyramids of Anahuac and Totteca. In India, Eturia and Greece the tumulus is found rising gradually into monumental magnificence.

Now, in mounding the tomb thus progressively enlarged, the earth could not be piled up to any great extent without inconveniently widening the base nor kept up against the weather without

some means of support. To remedy this double inconvenience, the mound was tucked to a certain height by a slope or ground-work of stone; then, to ease the lateral pressure and to promote the great end of elevation, a shaft was inserted, first in the centre, and after, repeated in process of experience, at each of the four corners. The term "corners" is used, for the forcing would necessarily be angular and unbroken lines, no curved masonry being thought of at that time. Now let these five stays, or, as they are technically termed, steles, be supposed to pass quite naturally from perishable wood to durable stone; these pillars to be hung with bells, and the whole roofed in by an umbrella and we have the tope tombs of China as they exist to-day. Let the steles be elevated gradually, that is to say, abstracted from the earth, until elongated into towers of some four hundred feet high, and we have restored in the mind's eye the celebrated Tomb of Porsena, in Etruria, reckoned in ancient times one of the wonders of the world. Let the five towers, which have thus outgrown the original purpose, be next fasciculated into one by simply filling in the facing produced upward, of course, to a point, and we behold the primeval birth of the pagodas of India and the pyramids of Meroe. Let this tomb-temple of a provincial Ragis be duly proportioned to the magnificence of a universal monarch, and lo! we have the great pyramids of Egypt, the tombs of the monarchs and great men of that ancient land.

From this we see that the tomb, fortified into a mound, elevated into a monument, abstracted into a pyramid or pagoda, was the first and is the simplest architectural formation. We may go into the history of the habitations of the dead at some future time.

MARC F. VALLETTE.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE MYSTERY OF BEING.

THE average man speculates very little, if at all, on the things he finds around him, and even educated people seldom push their theories to their ultimate conclusions. This is especially true of modern scientists, who have for the most part set up an impassible barrier between Physics and Metaphysics. This is to be regretted, as the logical conclusions to be drawn from the teachings of science are of enormous importance. There are no doubt many eminent Physicists who do not hesitate to state their convictions in no faltering tones. In the present paper we are concerned with the most fundamental fact underlying all science—the existence of eternal being!

If one were to ask an intelligent carpenter to prove that the blow of his hammer is the cause which drives a nail through a board, he would think his questioner had taken leave of his senses; but with all his conviction he could give no further proof than to repeat that he knows it to be so. If our carpenter were to be solemnly assured that the hammer had no part in driving the nail into the wood, but that it just happened that whenever the hammer touched the nail the latter began to move forward, the two actions being simultaneous, but perfectly independent of each other, he would no doubt look at his informant with feelings of pity or annoyance, according as he thought him serious or indulging in a silly joke.

The workman is, of course, right in saying that *we know* such a fact to be true. The principle of causality is in the same category as the fact of the freedom of the will or that of our own personality. They are facts of experience. I know I am myself, and I know that I am free to choose in certain of my actions, and conclude that the same facts are true of others also. In the same way I know and feel that I am the true cause of definite effects in my own mind and body, and that I produce effects on objects outside myself and that I am subject to the influence of my own will. Therefore, I conclude that other beings are able to cause effects one on the other. All science is founded on this principle. Without it it would be impossible to formulate laws concerning the actions or properties of material things. It is here recalled because it is the basis of all speculation and reasoning on the fundamental truths of science.

The mental development of an intelligent human being who relied altogether on reason would probably be somewhat as follows: Having become familiar with the principal facts of physical science and having studied the laws which natural phenomena obey, he would pass on to generalizations and would become acquainted with

the universal laws which apply to all science. He would thus arrive at a knowledge of the law of the "conservation of energy" and would be impressed by Lord Kelvin's* assertion of the gradual running down of the stock of "available energy" in the universe, and would eventually arrive at the conclusion that the energy of our system must have a beginning. For otherwise all differences of temperature throughout this limited universe of ours would long ago have disappeared. He would also accept the statement that this earth of ours, as well as all the planets, were once too hot to allow living things to exist on their surfaces. Thus the origin of life would demand an explanation. Having satisfied himself that no case of spontaneous generation has ever been proved, he would find no other explanation satisfactory than that life was produced in the universe by some principle which was the source and origin of all life and energy. He would feel called on to meet fairly the problem of creation—and of a creator.

The great theologians who so often bore the student with nice distinction and abstruse reasoning on the nature of such a being are scientists who deal with the fundamental philosophy of being. For them the Creator—or God—is the most real and important object in the universe and the most worthy of study. The knowledge of other things has interest for them only in so far as it tends to shed some light on the subject which absorbs all their interest. The natural philosopher who generalizes on the phenomena of nature is always brought back to the fact of the æther, which becomes for him, though unseen and unfelt, the most real and important thing in the material universe, and other facts of science seem of fundamental importance in proportion as they help him to a more complete knowledge of this all-pervading substance. No fact, however minute, can afford to be overlooked, for oftentimes the solution of a problem depends on some apparently unimportant detail, which may be so easily ignored. Just as the smallest fact concerning the phenomena of magnetism, electricity, gravitation and the like seems worth a long and arduous investigation on account of the light its solution may throw on the laws of ætherial physics, so the philosopher considers the smallest detail concerned with the nature of the origin of being worth a long and detailed examination. Sometimes the critics forget that a great deal of theology and philosophy does not profess to be more than speculation.

In this article it is only intended to call attention to one aspect of the question, but one which goes to the very root of the mystery of being. We are accustomed to look on the note of "Creator" as

[1] *Cf.* "Lord Kelvin and the Existence of God," by the writer, issued by "The Catholic Mind," America Press.

being the most suitable for designating a supreme being, but it is not difficult to show that there is a more fundamental note than this. The most fundamental of all possible concepts of the first cause is that in which the mind represents it as a being which proceeds from no other, whose existence postulates no relationship whatever with anything existing outside itself. This fact has been accepted by the metaphysicians as the note which essentially distinguishes the supreme being from every other being. They define such a being as *'Ens a se,"* i. e., *"Being which is of itself."* The fact of a being which accurately corresponds to this definition is the most certain and necessary deduction from scientific reasoning. When we attempt to realize the nature of such a being we find it simply overpowering, and it is true to say that no language could describe this concept. We may, however, make an attempt to state the nature of the problem.

There is in the human mind an instinctive desire to know the reasons of things, and the greatest scientist is like a little child in his endeavor to explain to himself all that falls under the observation of his senses. This tendency points to a spontaneous attempt to connect everything with some previous cause—a tacit admission of the principle of causality. There is nothing in nature which does not suggest this investigation, and the more complicated the object, the more imperatively does it demand an explanation, and the more perfect its constitution, the greater perfection do we seek in that which produced it. This kind of intellectual curiosity so often fails to be satisfied that we soon become oblivious to it, and it is only when some new and hitherto unnoticed object falls under our observation that this latent craving for such knowledge becomes apparent. It requires an effort to remind ourselves that the oldest and commonest things are as wonderful as the most surprising developments of modern scientific research; that the blade of grass or a sunbeam or an apple falling from a tree are mysteries so great that no scientist attempts to do more than to describe the phenomena by employing vague language and imperfect illustration. No attempt has been made to lift the veil, behind which some agency is at work which eludes the senses. What this agency is we know not. Of the fundamental nature of the forces which manifest themselves in the operation of nature we are profoundly ignorant. One thing alone we do not doubt—they all have a cause.

There is no difficulty in accounting for the *absence* of anything which does not appear to be necessary. It is the *presence* of such things which arouses our curiosity and demands an explanation. When Robinson Crusoe walked along the beach of his island he was not surprised at the absence of footprints on the sand; he never

considered such a possibility—their absence was for him the normal condition of affairs. But no sooner did he perceive the familiar mark of a human foot than his whole attitude of mind was completely changed. Amongst the conflicting thoughts which rushed in on his mind we may be sure that the one idea which did not present itself was that these marks got there of themselves or without the agency of a human foot which caused them. The footprints themselves ceased to be a matter of absorbing interest as soon as they had been examined and identified as human. They served merely as an index to the cause which had produced them, and every faculty now began to strain towards the knowledge of the human cause who alone could have made them. How much more true would be all this if Crusoe had found the proverbial watch! So it is with everything around us. Every one of them points to a previous agent, and if we do not oftener feel interest and curiosity about the agencies which produced them, it is partly because we are so accustomed to their presence—and partly because we have not sufficiently developed our powers of reasoning and observation. Existence and change demand a cause; non-existence and inertia seem the normal condition of things.

All this is true of our attempt to penetrate into the mystery which surrounds the fundamental truths of nature. It is the origin of being which presents the supreme difficulty. We may easily enough prescind from our own existence and gaze into a great space or void wherein we can see no existing object, just as on a summer day we look out on a calm sea under a canopy of blue when sea and sky seem insensibly to blend into one harmonious whole, unbroken by any object which could arrest the attention. Such a scene is restful to look upon, because there is nothing which appeals strongly to the senses, and therefore nothing which demands an explanation. But no sooner does a ship appear on the horizon than our imagination begins to endow it with a history—whence it comes, whither it goes, its size, its character. In a word, its *presence* requires a cause. So, too, when we realize the presence of any object in the vast void which our imagination has created, the mind at once begins to seek for an adequate explanation of its appearance. How came it there, when did it begin to be, who made it? These and a hundred other questions present themselves. The empty universe, implying the absence of the earth and of all other things, does not ask for an explanation; the tiniest object in that space imperiously invites us to seek its cause. It need not be there; why is it there?

Our reason and experience tell us that the majority of the things we see around us are not necessary. We see no reason why this particular house in which we live should be in existence at all or be

just quite the kind of house it is. We realize that there was a time when it was not, and in spite of our affection for our home, we realize that a time must come when it will be no longer. We know that neither we ourselves nor our friends have always been, and we have no doubt that there will be an end to mortal existence. Every one of these and similar things tell of a beginning, and from them we argue that older things had a beginning, too. That which experience and observation tell us about much which is around us science teaches us of things further from us. The geologist builds up for us the earth on which we stand; the astronomer and physicist tell us how the planets gradually assumed their present shapes, and we see nothing which contradicts their teaching. They speak of beginnings, and this concept so harmonizes with the demands of our reason that we accept it willingly.

Yet the satisfaction we feel in such explanations is not complete. We feel that the solution of our difficulties is not final. Science tells us that this universe as we now behold it had a beginning, and that the matter from which it sprang was once distributed as cosmic dust throughout space. Whence came this cosmic dust? If it be made up of elements smaller still, be they electrons or other bodies, whence came they? If these elements be but a modification of an all-prevailing ether, whence came this ether? These are the problems which must be faced by all who would attempt to account for the facts around them. It is the answer to this problem which involves the greatest mystery of the universe.

We may state the problem thus. Something exists. Even the idealist who professes that nothing can be asserted to exist outside his own thinking principle must at least admit that it exists. Anything which does exist either existed always or proceeded from some previously existing being or else began to exist for itself. The last supposition may be at once ruled out as a contradiction in terms. For nothing could pass from nothingness into existence of itself. We have thus to choose between the two former alternatives. Everything which exists was therefore produced by something else or has existed forever. If we reply that it is possible that things which exist now may be but items in a series which can be traced back interminably, then the alternative may be stated in slightly different words. Either existing things have always existed or they are part of a series which has always existed, or, finally, they have proceeded either directly or indirectly from a cause which has always been in existence. The existence of the smallest thing implies everlasting being!

This, then, is the conclusion to which reason must lead—that there exists something which had no beginning and which even in

thought has no dependence on anything outside itself. It is easy to repeat these words, but when we attempt to examine the nature of such an existence, the mind can do no more than assent to the proposition that such a being must exist, and endeavor to formulate the necessary consequences of such a being. We can fix our attention on an object which is asserted to have had no beginning and prescind from all other objects. This object may be conceived as the only body in the universe, and in some way we may study the nature of its being. In the first place, the mind asks instinctively *how* this object came into existence, or, rather, how it exists. There was never an instant when it was not; there was never an instant when it passed from non-existence into existence. Thus it was produced by no cause, for cause implies priority of some sort. Therefore, it must exist of itself and without any dependence of any kind on any other object. The mind goes on to ask *why* it exists? As we have considered, the mind demands a reason for everything. Here, however, there is no other reason to be given than that this being exists because it *must exist.* It is inconceivable that it could ever have not existed, for then there would have been no possibility of its coming into existence. Since it exists, the only reason which can be assigned is that its nature is such that ie demands existence. It is, in fact, *a necessary being.*

Thus we are forced to acknowledge a being which had its existence from no other being which always was, a being which could not but be in existence. This conclusion is so different from any which the mind arrives at from the study of nature that a sense of complete impotence comes over us when we attempt to bring home to ourselves this notion of being which had no origin and which involves no cause. We keep asking ourselves involuntarily, "Why does such a being exist? Why does anything exist? Why should not an empty space be necessary rather than an existing being?" The intellect can but repeat the self-same words: "It exists because it is necessary that it should exist." When we try to understand the nature of such a claim, we can but bow our heads in reverence and in awe in presence of so great a mystery. Surely here is a fact in comparison with which every other mystery seems easy to accept, and yet this is a conclusion which is absolutely certain, and which demands an assent firmer and more absolute than that which we give to the best supported result of scientific research.

But it may be urged we have only shown that *something* must exist, and who will say that this something is different from the material universe around us? The agnostic may say that we know nothing about matter, and that therefore we can assert nothing of its beginnings. We cannot, it is true, form any but the vaguest

concept of the fundamental nature of matter, but we can at least come to certain conclusions as to the limitations of that nature. If a being is such that existence is a necessary note of its nature, then that being can no more cease to exist than it could have begun to exist. Hence anything which ceases to be cannot be identified with the necessary existing first cause. If human life were "necessary," then it could never cease to exist; hence life is not a necessary property of matter. Neither is the "available energy" of the universe a "necessary being," for it, too, will one day cease to be. And so if we examine the properties of the things we see around us, we speedily come to the conclusion that if there is anything necessary in their constitution, it must be the primal matter or ether which constitutes the basis of the material universe. But the matter cannot rest there. When we examine the universe, from the great solar system to the smallest molecule of matter which can be subjected to analysis, we find a most wonderful harmony and coördination of parts and balancing of mutual forces, so that the whole universe works as a perfect machine. It is just here that the application of the principle of causality is most valuble. Just as life comes from life, so—with far greater evidence—does order come from intellect. Without intellectual principle there would be no more order in nature, especially as manifested in animated nature, than in a heap of stones or in the erratic motions of a crowd. The intelligent principle of order must evidently be prior to the matter constituting the ordered universe. Hence if matter be without a beginning *a fortiori,* the intelligent principle of order was without a beginning.

Lord Kelvin was accustomed to lay great stress on the importance of accounting for the order in the material universe: "I feel profoundly convinced that the argument from design has been greatly too much lost sight of in recent zoölogical speculations." It is not sufficient for the philosopher to study nature from the standpoint of being and energy. Just as our own personal experience convinces us of the reality of *efficient* causality, so, too, we appreciate the principle of *formal* causality. In other words, we know that we never produce an orderly result without intending it; and the more complicated the result we aim at, the greater is the need for the intervention of intellect. As the philosophers were accustomed to say: "What is last in execution must be first in intention." Unless the concept of the orderly arrangement is present to the intellect, it is certain that the orderly effect will not be produced. Our reason tells us when we examine a watch that it is the outcome of an intellectual principle. We no more suppose the materials of which it is constructed to be themselves the principle of order than we suppose the chemical substances which go to build up our bodies to be

the principle of life and thought. When, therefore, we examine the evident order in the universe, we are at once aware of an interdependence of the various parts which points clearly to an intellectually ordered design. By the same kind of reasoning as we have already employed we must conclude that an Intelligence must have existed forever; that it exists necessarily, and therefore that it is uncreated. In fact, we identify It with the First Cause—with God.

H. V. Gill, O. P.

Dublin, Ireland.

THE CROSS AND THE SWORD.

WHERE the blood of President Madero soaked the soil of Mexico and where Victoriano Huerta so long hurled defiance to his foreign and domestic foes, a hundred thousand Aztecs once assembled to do homage to the sun-god in their religious feast, the *piece de resistance* of which was a line of human sacrifices two miles long. It is related that at the dedication of the great temple to Huitzilopochtli, the god of war, in the year 1486, perhaps eighty thousand victims were sacrificed.

"Each prisoner," it is said, "was stretched on a flat sacrificial stone, five priests securing his head and his limbs, while a sixth, clad in a scarlet mantle, dexterously opened the breast with a sharp knife and inserting his hand in the wound, tore out the heart, and first holding the body up toward the sun, threw it to the people, who divided it among themselves for cannibalistic purposes." These are the Indian antecedents of the present day Mexican leaders whose human sacrifice is made in the name of liberty.

It is nearly four hundred years since the Spanish conquistadors first invaded Mexico. These daring explorers were searching for gold, having had their ambition fired by the tales of returned navigators. On reaching the shores of this continent they found immense temples profusely decorated with the precious metal they sought and the people a race of sun-worshippers. The Spaniards ceased to yearn for the fabled Babylonian wonders of India, and being welcomed as gods by the Indians, they set up an empire, which in its grandeur was second only to that of old Spain, and between times, while engaged in the task of procuring treasure for the Spanish galleons to carry home, proceeded to convert the natives to the creed of the Cross.

The trail of the Spanish conquest through Mexico and Central America is easily traced by the splendid churches they chose to

erect literally by every brookside where they stopped for water and near every tree whose shade afforded them rest. The creed of the Cross as taught by the Roman Catholic priest is woven inseparably into the history of Spanish America.

As a consequence there has been much criticism of Spanish colonization methods by North American statesmen. She has been accused in our United States Senate of "raising more crosses in more lands and under them shedding more blood than all the other nations of the earth combined."

We lose sight of the fact that in the North where Boston now stands the Puritans killed or drove out the Indians, and what few are left are penned up on reservations, pitiful objects of government charity, remnants of a dying race.

How different the history of the Indians of Central America. Though as a mass they are ignorant and uneducated, they are industrious, amiable and faithful, and were so found by the Spanish conquistadors. All the labor of the country rests on them. They form the small merchant and the farm labor class; they weave the cloth and cultivate the sugar and coffee. Unlike the North American Indians, they embraced Christianity with a singleness of heart and purpose that is remarkable.

The North American Indian refused to bend his neck to the yoke of toil or his back to the burden of the cross as carried by the Puritan Fathers. His nature was closed alike to the brotherly love of the Quakers and the mortification of the flesh as practiced by the Puritans. There was no appeal to his imagination in either the sombre religious precepts or practices of those religious zealots who drove him from home and preëmpted his best hunting preserves.

Quite to the contrary was the effect on the Aztecs and Toltecs of Central America of the cassocked padre, who in fatherly fashion opened his arms and invited the little red savages to come into the fold. The Indian imagination was appealed to in the sign of the cross, the image of the Virgin and the saints and the ceremonies of the Mass.

The North American Indian could not be forced to extend his vision to the throne of a Heavenly Father, but his brother of the Southland could comprehend, when, with the crucifix held aloft before him, he was told: "This is the cross where the Saviour died; this the bleeding image of the Saviour," and when the Indian curiosity stirred him to inquire whose was the maternal figure kneeling at the foot of the cross, his human needs made him willing to believe in the "Blessed Virgin." It was only a mental step from the idol of the Aztec to the impersonation of a living God, but a

step, guided by the skillful hand of the padre, that the simple mind of the Indian could easily take.

The colonizer of the North country was his own hewer of wood and drawer of water, while the Spanish grandee, to the manor-born, found the tropical Indian an economic necessity. It is but fair to say that it is not the Indian as a class, who has degenerated and allowed his blood to mingle in the production of an inferior race; it is his lord, the white man, descendant of the conquistador, once accorded the veneration of a Deity by the simple-hearted sun-worshipper. He is it who has kept the country distraught with revolution—not for religion, but in the name of religion, in order to gain the sympathy of the Indian who has come to hold the honor of the Church dearer than life.

Luxury loving and idle in a temperate climate, but doubly so in a land basking in the eternal springtime of a tropical sun, these are the ones who have drifted into a class of parasites, fated to go down into the race of life, just as the Romans and Greeks have done before them.

It is in keeping with the destiny of the world that the civilization of the white race should complete its cycle here on the American continent. Mexico and Central America have been the melting-pot of the races, probably since the days of Adam. Archæologists have proven this by uncoverings acres of monoliths covered with masks and hieroglyphics, buried since the twelfth century in the ruins of ancient Indian cities. Among the masks are found some decidedly un-American types—that of a negro whose thick lips and wooly hair furnish proof of his African blood; a Chinese head, that of a native of Java, Japanese and even Caucasian types. Many of the masks have retreating foreheads and not a few have Greek profiles. All go to show that many different races have succeeded one another or amalgamated on this continent.

Every civilization is said to be marked by its religion. If this be so, accounts of the past glory of the Spanish colonies that have come down to us cannot have been much exaggerated. The churches that dot the map of Central America are unequaled in their grandeur in either Italy or Spain. Their number is surprising. They are found at the edge of the jungle and by the seashore, perched high on the sides of a mountain, their white mission walls silhouetted in picturesque effect against a background of forest trees, or, fronting the village plaza, the bell sends out its call to vespers, as the Indians stoop low on the ground over a charcoal fire lighted in preparation of the evening meal.

Of the Central American group, the Republic of Guatemala has the best collection of church buildings and relics at the present

time. This is due to the fact that as the seat of capital of the young empire, it became the pet colony of Charles the Fifth, who bestowed on its churches shiploads of rare art works, marks of royal favor to loyal subjects. Guatemala, which is the next State south of Mexico, lies somewhat out of the beaten path of travel, and the churches there are much the same as they were three hundred years ago. There is nothing cheap and tawdry in the relics or altar decorations. The notorious sea pirate Morgan did not attempt to penetrate into the mountainous region and pillage the churches, as was the case in Panama and Costa Rica. If he had, he would have gotten considerably more loot than he took from those countries to the south, which lying on the coast, were open to his depredations.

Much of the church property formerly used as convents and monasteries have been confiscated by the Liberal party for government usage, but the relics and the churches proper have been carefully preserved. Here one may see immense altars, exquisitely carved, covered in gold leaf. Many are further ornamented with inlaid work of mother-of-pearl. Quaint confessionals, resembling throne chairs, with steps on three sides, on which the penitent may kneel, are still in use. Silver and gold candlesticks, rare altar vases, wood carvings and jewel studded images are here in great profusion. Images of saints moulded solidly in silver are not uncommon. In the Church of Santo Domingo, in Guatemala City, now the capital of the Republic, there is a statue of St. Anthony, or San Antonio, about three feet high and worth its weight in silver, remarkable for an emerald fully two inches square set into the breast. Experts say this gem is perfect.

No native would ever dream of stealing the church relics. They are holy. Foreign residents of the country sometimes manage to pick up a rare antique after they have gained the friendship and confidence of the people. Pancha, my maid, came to me one day and said she had seen a beautiful "rosario" in a shop on the Calle Real or Royal Road. It belonged to a poor widow who had to sell it or starve. Pancha described the rosary as being so unusual that I determined to go and look at it. We set off in the direction of the little plaza to the south of the capital and soon arrived at the place. It was in a one story house, having a single window with iron bars. The outside wall of the house was painted pink. Over the door was a sign which read, "Saints for Rent."

We were met at the door by the proprietor, who invited us to enter and help ourselves to anything we cared to take. This is a form of Spanish politeness that it is better not to put to the test. Should you take him at his word, you could never hope to over-

come his contempt. While the proprietor went into another room to get the rosary, Pancha explained that the imposing array of images on the shop shelves could be rented on special occasions by people who could not afford to own their own. Hung about the walls were many religious paintings very crudely executed. Since the discovery of a Rubens here some years ago, all of the shopkeepers invested heavily in old paintings, and should you see one that struck your fancy, the shopkeeper would ask an exorbitant price, suspecting that you had discovered a masterpiece. A glass case filled with coin bracelets, a collection of Indian rag dolls and a baby perambulator with broken springs were among the other wares on display.

The proprietor placed the rosary on the counter for inspection. Pancha had not exaggerated its beauty. It was fully two and one-half yards long. Each bead, the size of a marble, was of ivory, hand carved and capped with silver. The crucifix, hammered out of the same metal, was four inches long. Above this, in a design that resembled lace work, was the escutcheon of the Church of La Merced. The relic was so old that the head of the Christ on the crucifix was nearly worn away. I asked the price of the rosary and was told it was for sale at fifty dollars gold. As it was worth this, I did not care to bargain for it and turned to go out.

"You will not buy?" asked Pancha, evidently disappointed.

"No; I cannot pay fifty dollars."

"Well," said Pancha, with that freedom characteristic of all the Indian servants, "if you will not buy, at least go back and put it around your neck. It will bring you good luck."

The next day I returned to get it, but it was gone. The widow who owned it had won some money in the lottery, and now being well off, did not care to sell.

There are thirty Catholic churches regularly open for worship in and about Guatemala City. That of La Merced, where the rosary belonged, is one of the oldest and most interesting. In it is the curious old altar, carved of wood and painted in natural tones, depicting the grief of Alvarado, the first captain general of the Empire, and his wife Beatrice over the death of their infant son. La Merced is the only church outside of the Cathedral having crypts for burial purposes. These were abandoned some years ago because of an epidemic of cholera that proved very disastrous. Now the dead are interred in mausoleums and apartment house vaults in an imposing burial ground outside of the city.

It was with the permission of the Archbishop of Guatemala that we were allowed to go through the crypts, now closed to visitors, where we had been told we would be shown through a "rogues

gallery" of skeletons. In company with several other Americans I visited the church one morning just as the people were assembling for six o'clock Mass. The church stands on a raised court of flat stones and covers an entire block. In the walls, once white adobe, but grown gray with time, are deep cracks, showing that the church has held out bravely against repeated earthquakes. The people hurried up the steps, pausing now and then to pat an acquaintance on the back by way of greeting. In the weather-beaten tower, which serves as belfry, a small boy sat astride the cross beam pounding vigorously on the bell with a hammer. This was the call to Mass. There is nothing musical in the church bells here. They are all rung at about the same time, sending forth harsh, discordant sounds that would better suit a fire department. At the door of the church sat a woman leper, who extended her bony hand for alms, never pausing in her incessant recitation of the rosary. Inside the floor of the church was covered with kneeling figures. The women all wore black shawls, which they held drawn over their heads. Many of the men stood, hats in hand, during the service. The churches here are not supplied with benches and such a thing as soft cushions for the knees are unheard of. It was a most inspiring sight to witness at this hour of the morning this sea of black-robed figures, their knees pressed hard on the cold stone floor, their faces full of devotion, turned toward the altar, and to hear their voices raised in a chant of adoration, the sweet low tones borne out as on the crest of a gentle wave, its echoes reverberating as it swept the length and breadth of the church. At a side altar, where they had lighted a dozen small candles, knelt a party of Indians. These had come in over the mountain roads this morning and had stopped, on their way to market, to say a prayer for a sick relative. The women held baskets of vegetables and eggs on their heads, while the babies were strapped on their backs. The men had left their packs at the front door. Both women and men were in their bare feet. Each man carried his machete, a very dangerous looking knife, stuck in his belt. This seems strange until one learns that the machete is not worn for murderous purposes, but is a form of decoration very much after the English fashion of carrying a cane.

When the Mass was over the sacristan opened a door for us in the floor of the church, and with two acolytes holding candles to light the way, we descended a flight of stone steps into the burying ground of a past generation. Once on level ground we found ourselves some distance below the street and in a round room, in the centre of which was piled a heap of skulls. Four posts were ranged around this, ornamented with chains, skulls and cross bones. It

was a very spooky place. Half buried in the dirt of the earth were small mahogany coffins holding the remains of celebrities. The most horrifying spectacle, however, was that presented to our gaze when on looking around the wall, we discovered a startling array of skeletons, each robed in the cassock and hat of a priest, chained to the wall by their necks. The skin that covered the bones was perfect, but the color of old leather. It was impossible to look at these mummies and imagine they could ever have lived. The faces told that they had suffered unspeakable agonies. One had had his tongue pulled out and another had been bled to death. One, over six feet tall, a magnificent specimen of humanity, had had both legs broken. Horror-stricken, we demanded to know of the sacristan why these poor creatures had been tortured this way. But she was old and deaf. He shook his head and shrugged his shoulders. "Quien sabe?" ("who knows?") he replied.

As we left the church we noticed a young Indian mother with a small baby on her back, making a pligrimage of the church shrines. She would stop before every altar, kneel and kiss the floor. She made several unsuccessful attempts to make the baby do likewise, but the little thing would throw out its arms and brace its body back from the floor. The mother became so exasperated at the bad conduct of her child and kneeling before a painting of the Madonna Della Sedia, she held the youngster's hands, shoving its head down on the stone floor with such force that we thought the child had been hurt. It never whimpered, and the mother, thoroughly satisfied, swung her basket of vegetables on her head and her baby on her back and trotted off toward the market.

The Cathedral, which stands fronting the Plaza de Armis, is one of the finest edifices in the country. It has the distinction of being the first building erected in the capital and of having taken thirty-three years in its construction. Unlike the majority of the other buildings made to withstand earthquakes, which often number as high as twenty-five in one day, the Cathedral is raised somewhat off the ground. Across the front are four statues of the Apostles, much over life size. Adjoining is the residence of the Archbishop, quite an imposing home, with handsomely carved mahogany doors and windows with ornamental iron bars. In the Cathedral are many images and rare pieces of carving, taken from the old capitol known as "St. James of Gentlemen," when the latter was destroyed by earthquake in 1774. Among them is a life size statue of Christ on the road to Calvary, said to be the finest piece of wood carving of its kind in the world.

The way in which these valuable antiques found their way into the churches here goes back to the history of the conquest of

Spanish America, when in the year 1520, following the invasion of Mexico, Cortez and his men unfurled the Spanish flag, planted the cross under it and drew their swords in the protection of both. The spirit of the conquest is ably illustrated by historians, who relate that when Cortez landed he was repulsed in battle with the Indians. Anticipating that his followers would seek safety in flight, he set fire to his fleet, forcing his men to conquer the country or die in the attempt. The native Indians were sun-worshippers, who had a legend that told of a powerful deity who was to come out of the East and rule them. The Spaniards had no recourse but to take possession of the country and used their firearms with disastrous effect. The Indians, seeing the fire from the weapons, supposed it came out of the nostrils of the horses which the Spaniards rode, and being duly impressed, they remembered their old legend and thought that they recognized in the foreigners their long expected deity. This gave the Spaniards a free entry and was the greatest factor in the conquest of the country.

The Indians were known as Aztecs, descendants of the Toltecs, the latter a highly intelligent race, who worshipped an "Unknown God, the Cause of Causes," and believed that the life hereafter would be one of peace and happiness. In the course of time their high morals and sound philosophy had given way to the barbarous custom of the Aztecs, chief among these being cannibalism, which they practiced at their religious feasts. The Spaniards, cruel and rapacious as they often were, were astonished and repulsed, when attending the Aztec celebrations, to find that no sooner had the priest torn out the heart from a victim still warm with life than the fanatic worshippers, waiting round in hordes, seized upon the body like starving dogs at a bone, and tearing it in pieces between them, devoured it.

Inspired by a desire for the gold so profusely used in the adornment of the Indian temples and feeling no religious qualms at the slaughter of a people so plainly outside the fold of civilization, the Spaniards soon plotted the downfall of the Aztecs.

"It was the month of May," writes Father Durna, the Mexican Toxcatl, "when it was customary for the Aztecs to celebrate their great annual festival in honor of their war god Huitzilopochtli, which was commemorated by sacrifice, religious songs and dances in which all the Mexican nobility engaged, displaying their magnificent costumes, with brilliant mantles of feather work, sprinkled with precious stones, their necks, arms and legs ornamented with collars and bracelets of gold. Pedro de Alvarado, whom Cortez had left as lieutenant while he conducted an expedition against an enemy, was petitioned by the Indian caciques to

be allowed to perform their rites. Alvarado agreed upon condition that on this occasion there should be no human sacrifice and that they should come without weapons. He and his soldiers attended as spectators. They were all armed, but as this was not unusual, it excited no suspicion. As soon as the festival, held in the court of the great temple, had fairly begun and the Indians were engrossed in the exciting movements of the dance and their religious chants, Alvarado and his followers, at a given signal, rushed with drawn swords on their defenseless hosts. The pavement ran with streams of blood and the ground was strewed with dead. Over six hundred of the flower of the Aztec nobility fell in this affray. The tidings of the affair filled the natives with stupefaction and dismay; they immediately set about to be revenged by throwing up earthworks around the castle where the Spaniards were domiciled and suspending the market to cut off food supplies. The situation of the Spaniards was desperate, when they were relieved by the sudden return of Cortez. The city again rose to arms and besought the Aztec Emperor to mediate with his subjects. The Spaniards now endeavored to effect a retreat out of the city. This they accomplished under cover of a dark drizzling night after a fearful carnage and bloodshed lasting over several days. The conquistadors left the city, lately the scene of great triumphs, loaded with as much gold and jewels as they could carry, to meet death in the murky waters of the canal. The Spanish leaders, followed by the tattered remnants of their troops who had escaped, were allowed to defile to an adjacent village, where Cortez, on beholding the deplorable condition of his thinned ranks, gave vent to the anguish of his soul."

Alvarado was severely reprimanded for thus dealing with the natives in the absence of Cortez. The latter now assembled his forces and attacked the Mexicans with such vigor that his fame spread terror through the South, and the Kachiquel kings sent word of their willingness to become vassals of Spain. Cortez received these ambassadors very kindly and dispatched Alvarado to take possession of the country. That Alvarado proved equal to the occasion is evidenced by the fact that in a short time he had installed himself as captain general of the territory of Central America. His rights in this respect were afterwards questioned and he was called to Spain to give an account of himself. He proved a clever politician, for history shows that he returned to establish an empire with the sanction of the King of Spain.

The country, now known as Guatemala, proved especially pleasing to Alvarado and he determined to place his capital here. The climate of the mountainous plateau, seven thousand feet above sea

level, was like that of perpetual springtime. There were no mosquitoes, poisonous snakes and sand flies to make life miserable. The blue of the sky, the majesty of the volcanoes that formed a backbone through the country, multitudes of birds with brilliant plumage and fields of flowers appealed to the love of the beautiful inherent in every true Spaniard. The green meadows were well watered by abundant streams, insuring good pasturage for the horses and cattle, and the soil was so fertile they had only to scratch the ground to produce every variety of fruit and vegetable to delight the eye and please the palate. Over and above all was the assurance, oft repeated by the Indians, that the mountains were made of gold and the foothills were lined with mines of precious stones. It was not within human province to turn away from so alluring a bit of earthly paradise, and the Spaniards, in spite of all things said of them to the contrary, were intensely human. At a place called "Almolonga," meaning in the Indian tongue "the mountain from which water flows," Alvarado laid out the site of his Capitol, which he called "St. James of Gentlemen." Here on a level plain lying between the two volcanoes, from one of which, "Agua," came water and from the other, "Fuego," meaning fire, issued volumes of smoke, the ceremonies that marked the founding of the city took place. On the 25th of July in 1524, at the festival of St. James, Alvarado and his men assembled, dressed in the superb costume of the period. While Juan Godines, chaplain of the army, said Mass, hundreds of Indians in festive attire crowded the plain and looked on. Tired with fighting, the Spaniards now prepared to enjoy the fruits of conquest. Here amid a throng of elegant ladies and handsome cavaliers they held their court, sixty years before Jamestown was founded and one hundred years before Henry Hudson sailed into the Bay of New York. But the beautiful city of their dreams was ill-starred. One calamity followed another in rapid succession. Finally, in the year 1541, after repeated earthquake shocks, an immense torrent of water rushed down the mountain side, carrying rocks and trees before it, demolishing the houses and burying the inhabitants under the walls, among the many victims being Dona Beatrice de la Cueba, widow of Alvarado, whom the natives believed had suffered this fate because she always signed her name "Beatrice, Most Unfortunate of Women."

The lure of the country was so strong that the Spaniards could not be dragged away from the spot, and in 1542 they again set to work and rebuilt the ruined city at a site a league distant. Here came great numbers of priests and nuns from European cities. Under their supervision was builded the Cathedral, which was 300

feet long, 150 feet wide and 70 feet high. Here was located an immense college for the Jesuits, where as many as 700 subjects were domiciled. The Franciscans and Capuchins occupied vast monasteries, buildings so large that they covered whole blocks and contained patios or courtyards big enough for ballrooms. Here many orders of the nuns taught the young girls sewing and painting, tended the sick and relieved the sufferings of the dying. But this splendid city was destined for a worse end than that which destroyed the first. After a series of earthquakes that were so terrifying that even the wild beasts left their haunts and came to seek shelter among men, the volcano of Fuego sent out a stream of fire which was followed soon after by a convulsion of the earth that tore down the buildings again, burying many of the inhabitants in the ruins.

Little is left to-day that tells of the one time grandeur of this city. The gray stones of the ruins form a safe shelter for the lizards when they come out to warm themselves in the bright sunshine. Trees have grown high in the walls, cracking the mortar to make way for their roots, and mosses and ferns now adorn many of the niches where once reposed image of saint and martyr. In the vast courtyards, where the Jesuits once took their daily exercise, mules, cows and pigs are stabled, and the vacant window frames that mark the spot where the imposing monastery of La Recollectos once stood, stare out on the world around them, their awful mystery, comparable to nothing so much as the vacant eye sockets of a human skeleton. And to-day the mountains of Agua and Fuego, that have caused this fearful destruction, are a mass of flower gardens and coffee farms, and the Indians who dwell among them in peace and contentment say they will never disturb the place again, seeing they have been blessed by a priest.

After the last destructive earthquake, which occurred in 1774, the people who escaped death in that disaster, decided to abandon the place, and after obtaining consent of the King of Spain, moved over to the valley of Las Vacas, and their first act after laying out the city was to build the Cathedral. All of the relics which adorned the forty-seven churches of the old capital were dug out of the ruins and brought here. Strange to say they have been singularly free from molestation during the frequent revolutions, which during the last fifty years have run a close second to the volcanoes in keeping the people in a state of terror.

Rufino Barrios, who rose from the state of a barefoot Indian boy to be President of the Republic, made one unsuccessful attempt to appropriate church relics. Barrios was elected by the party opposed to the Church, and it was under his regimé that most of

the convents were confiscated and the priests and nuns exiled. This striking instance of a native actually daring to attempt the desecration of a church altar affords a good example of the peculiarities of disposition of an Indian executive.

In the church of Santo Domingo, over the main altar, there is an image of the Virgin of Concepcion, fully six feet high and made of silver throughout. The gold crown on her head is studded with real gems. Completely surrounding the figure is a halo or rays, made also of silver and artfully designed to represent wheat and grapes, the symbol of bread and wine. A few precious stones are scattered over this for further ornamentation. At the close of one of the wars, Barrios was forever engaged in, it is related that one of his generals who had proven especially loyal, claimed as his reward this silver Virgin, which he proposed to have melted into money. Barrios could not be persuaded to grant this request, but he told his general, as a compromise, he could take the silver rays, studded with opals and emeralds, and do with it as he pleased. Accordingly the general sent to the church and demanded the instant surrender of the rays. But the padre in charge of Santo Domingo, having been warned of the generosity of Barrios, went quickly to work and copied the rays in tin, substituting this for the silver one, which he placed in hiding. The orderly sent by the general rode up to the church and delivered his message. The priest seemed reluctant to comply with this rather unusual request, protesting against such an act of sacrilege and declaring that no good would come of it. The messenger could do nothing but obey orders, so the rays was delivered, and he rode away to present it to the general. The latter soon discovered that he had been deceived, that instead of the silver he had expected to use in a carousal, he had received only a pile of worthless old tin, so he took the matter to the President and demanded the immediate execution of the priest.

When Barrios heard the story he burst out laughing. The general, furious at being ridiculed, became very angry.

"It is mine," he shouted. "I will have it and the priest must die."

"Stop," said Barrios, his face growing stern. "The priest is smarter than you are. He shall keep his trinkets because he earned them. You are like a cow for dullness and fit only to associate with them."

The President then laughed louder than before, and the general walked out so humiliated, that no one ever again asked to be rewarded for heroic services by melting the silver Virgins.

Not alone the priests, but the Indians themselves, are very artful in protecting these relics if they imagine any danger confronts

them. This is supposed to have been the case in the mysterious disappearance of the Virgin made of gold that was formerly in the church of El Cerrito del Carmen (little hill of the Carmen). The church itself is very interesting. It is situated on a grassy knoll overlooking the city, at its base a fringe of the cocoa madre, which, when in bloom, showers the ground with lovely pink and white blossoms. In the distance are the twin volcanoes, Agua and Fuego, and a little volcano, their son, whose peak is just discernible above the horizon and who is said to be growing taller year by year. The church was built to serve the twofold need of temple and fort. It is said Barrios attempted to tear down the church and take the location for a barracks, but the hill shook so violently during an earthquake that he was swerved from his purpose through fear that the whole city might be destroyed.

The church of El Carmen was built especially for the gold Virgin from which it took its name. The image was given to Father Peter, a hermit, by some French nuns, who told him that they had been commanded in a dream to deliver the image to him, and that it would go into a far country and there perform miraculous deeds. The hermit sailed, and in due time landed in Central America, where he made a shrine for it in the forest. Father Peter at length decided that a church should be built, and after its completion announced a big feast to mark the opening ceremonies. All of the Indians attended in their gala clothes on the day the Lady of El Carmen was brought to her home, but imagine the consternation that ran through the crowd when it was learned that the image had disappeared. Some one suggested that the Lady did not like the big church and had gone back to her quiet shrine in the forest. The people set out in great crowds to investigate the matter, and to their surprise found the image back in the old place. It was again brought to the hill of El Cerrito, only to again disappear. On the last disappearance she was never found, and it is thought the Indians, believing the gold Virgin unhappy in the new abode, stole it away and buried it. Its place is now filled by a silver Virgin, but the Indians do not believe in her efficacy to cure, and so they have come to lose interest in the little church on the hill.

The celebration of a feast day, or fiesta, as it is called, is a great event with the people. There are something over two hundred of these holidays in each year. They serve a twofold purpose—first, in supplying an outlet for the emotions of a pleasure loving people, and, second, by reason of their strong appeal to the imagination, they have swept away the fierce tribal customs of the Aztecs, forcing the Indian unknowingly to fall into line in the march of civilization.

One of these, the feast of La Concepcion, is of particular interest. Rockets set off from the façade of the church at three o'clock of a Sunday afternoon announce the event. On this particular day we walked up to the church door between a row of Indian girls who sat cross-legged on the ground, with baskets of dulces and tamales in front of them. We bought some purple hued candies from one of the girls and asked what was going on inside of the church. She explained that the Virgin of San Francisca was going to make a visit on the Virgin of Santa Rosa. The church was decorated with huge satin banners and strips of bunting in yellow and white. We wedged our way inside. The scent of incense and the fragrant pine needle that covered the church floors signified a special feast day. From the front door we could hardly distinguish the form of the priest as he went about the celebration of the Mass, but there was not a nook or cranny over the entire floor that was not occupied by a kneeling black robed figure.

Suddenly the pipe organ burst forth in loud music and two acolytes, swinging censors, started for the front door. Eight men put their shoulders to the pedestal on which the Virgin of San Francisca stood and raised it up. The image, much larger than life sized, was dressed in red velvet and ermine. From under her crown came a cluster of heavy black curls that hung below her waist. The platform on which she was borne along was completely hidden beneath a blanket formed of lilies and white roses. Following the Virgin came four figures dressed to represent angels, each carried on the shoulders of two men. These angels wore their skirts above the knee, revealing socks held with ribbon garters. Their wings of white gauze made them appear to float in the air. Next came the priest in gorgeous vestments, walking under a silken canopy held aloft over his head by four acolytes. After the procession had moved out into the street, all the people prepared to follow. Pushing and crowding one another almost to the point of suffocation, they made their way through the city, while those who could not get into the jam stood on the sidewalk with heads bared and watched the procession go by. Often when passing a tienda, or store, the owner would run out and sprinkle flowers in the pathway. This was done to insure a good business for the shop.

At night the scene around the church of San Francisca was very animated. Skyrockets were set off at frequent intervals. There was music by a merimba, a native instrument played by four men, similar to our xylophone, but much larger. The Indian women built fires out in the street, where they paid close attention to the big pans of grease in which plaintains puffed out their sugary

sides until, swelled to a delicious brownness, they were taken out and sold piping hot to customers who loitered nearby. There was turkey and chicken, chopped up and decorated with peppers, big jars of chocolate and a drink made from pineapple juice. No black beans and tortillas on the bill of fare to-day; they belong solely to market day. The fires lighted up the wrinkled faces of the Indian women until they appeared not unlike pictures of witches stirring up mysterious potions in their cauldrons. And indeed some of these potions were mysterious enough. For instance, one platter was full of iguana, a kind of big lizard, having eyes like a rabbit, stewed up with tomatoes. This dish, when ready to serve, looks suspiciously as though a snake might have formed the main ingredient and is therefore repugnant to most Americans. The natives, however, consider it a great delicacy and say that it tastes like chicken.

The three greatest days in the year are Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of Holy Week. The whole passion is enacted in the streets. On Good Friday those who have been neglectful of their church duties during the year will pay fifty dollars just to carry the image of the bleeding Saviour half a block, when others pick it up and continue the imaginary march to Calvary. Women penitents stagger and almost faint beneath the weight of the weeping Virgin as she follows her Son to the place of crucifixion. The men participants wear most fantastic costumes. One order, known as the "Cucaracha" or cockroach, present a terrifying spectacle in their costumes of flowing black robe and immense black peaked cap.

That every one keeps posted on the feast days is evidenced by the custom of naming an infant for the saint on whose day it is born. On St. Paul's day, for instance, a resident of Central America will purchase birthday gifts for each of his friends who bears the name of "Pablo."

Gift giing is confirmed almost entirely to the "dia de santa," saint day or birthday. Christmas is a religious festival entirely. The Spanish children have no Santa Claus. Instead, on Noche Bueno (the Good Night) they will go to church and gather about the altar, whereon is depicted the birth of the Christ child by means of tableaux. In many homes they have what is called a nascimiento, wherein is again unfolded the story of the Nativity by means of a miniature art display.

The Indians have retained one curious custom that is not a part of the Church ritual. They are given to burning many candles. Very frequently these are found burning upside down. This means that some Indian entertains hatred toward another and is praying

that some terrible punishment may be visited upon his enemy. Padre Arzu, of Mexico, who has something over ten thousand parishioners, says that whenever he finds the candles burning upside down he makes a special sermon to his flock. After telling them of the discovery of the candle, he points out that he does not know who put it there, nor does he care to know, but that he, the priest, will say a prayer for that enemy, and the Indian, believing that the prayer of a holy man will get to heaven first, thus learns that he has lost his prayer and his candle, too.

The lure that held the conquistador in spite of earthquakes and various epidemics of disease is still a part of this country. That you may better understand the witchery that surrounds it, come with me, my reader, to the top of El Cerrito del Carmen. Let us climb together to the top of the little church from which the gold Virgin of Carmen disappeared so many years ago, and watch the sun as it shoots down behind Volcan de Agua, leaving behind it a mass of scarlet light to trail its course through the heavens, and like some immense skyrocket fixed behind the mountain of water, as we look the scarlet changes to old rose, then to lavender, and as a final salute to the dying day the whole sky is lighted up in a delicate shade of shell pink. Around the top of old Agua is a halo of fleecy clouds, but the bold one, Fuego, stands erect, clearly silhouetted against the sky. We look over the red tiled roofs of the adobe walled city, with its barred windows, where the pretty senoritas smile coyly at the passer-by, its patios full of flowers and its parks where the people gather to gossip. Our thoughts drift back to other days. In fancy we see pass before us at the foot of the hill where the cocoa mardre trees are in bloom a cortege of priests and acolytes, bearing the cross aloft and following in their train a procession of Spanish nobles. The houses seem to melt away and the plain is peopled with a throng of Indians gaily dressed for the occasion. The Indians prostrate themselves in the dust as the cross is borne along, and as it passes on they rise and join the procession, and in the chant that is wafted up to us on the soft evening breeze we catch the words, "Ave Maria."

A bugle note rings out on the stillness, and the priests, Spanish nobles and Indians disappear, and we look across to the fortress, where the soldiers are preparing a field piece to fire the sunset gun.

Down in the city the people are beginning to hurry indoors. The gloom that comes with the nightfall is better borne inside the house than out of doors, where political assassins may lurk in the shadows.

We turn and go down the narrow steps worn by the feet of many monks of bygone days. We reward the sacristan, who is

waiting in the courtyard of his little home, with a few reals. The children of the sacristan, scantily clothed, look at us and say "Gootby," and we reward them with half of a real for the one English word they know.

There is no twilight hour; the darkness comes down without warning and a myriad of stars appear. We walk home through streets that are almost deserted. All of the shutters are barred and the doors are closed. The great silence, as much a part of the tropics as the heat or rain, becomes oppressive after nightfall. All nature seems to be on tiptoe waiting for something to happen.

They say that with the opening of the Panama Canal something will happen in the shape of a mighty tide of commerce that will repeople the plains, teaching the natives self-government through the broader lesson of the brotherhood of man.

I told all this to an American, a resident of the country for fifty years and a non-Catholic.

"Quien sabe?" he said, using the Spanish expression that suggests so much and tells nothing. "I have lived here a long time. Now that the people have been given so-called liberty, they do not know what to do with it. To the uneducated peon it means license and laziness without restraint of any sort. In the old days the village that had a padre was blest indeed. To him the people flocked for counsel. He was both guide and friend. God pity us who live here if the day is to come when the Church teachings have been forgotten by the people of Spanish America."

N. F. Fyffe

Atlanta, Ga.

ROSWITHA, NUN AND DRAMATIST.

IT seems a strange thing that a play written by a Benedictine nun, who probably lived in the eleventh century, should have been acted upon a London stage in the twentieth century, yet, incongruous though it be, this was the case when "Paphnutius," a drama written by Roswitha, a Benedictine nun of Gandersheim monastery, was translated from the original Latin into English and produced last spring in a London theatre.[1]

Of Roswitha, or Hrotsuitha, herself very little seems to be known, and that little is by no means certain, for there was more than one Roswitha in the middle ages who were nuns at Gandersheim, and confusion has arisen between them. There was a Roswitha, Abbess of Gandersheim in the seventh century, a very

[1] "The Savoy." Miss Ellen Terry took a small part in it.

learned woman, a rhetorician and logician, who wrote a volume on logic considered by her contemporaries as an excellent work; she was the daughter of a King of Greece.

Then there was another Roswitha of royal birth, the daughter of Edric, King of Northumbria, who was a nun at Gandersheim for thirty-three years, and was believed by one Laurence Humfrey, an Englishman, who perhaps desired this honor for his countrywoman to be the poetess, but this is rightly denied by other writers, including Fabricius and Trithemius, who point out that the English Roswitha lived in the seventh century, while the poetess was of German origin and lived much later.

There is a good deal of doubt about the exact time in which Roswitha, the dramatist, lived: Trithemius sometimes puts her in the tenth and sometimes in the eleventh century, while the latest German writers place her death in 1102;[2] the most general opinion seems to be that she lived in the eleventh century, probably in the latter end of it.

Most writers agree that she was a Saxon of noble birth, and that she was educated at Gandersheim monastery, and after her profession lived there for the rest of her life as a Benedictine nun. She tells us herself in the preface to some of her poems that she was brought up at Gandersheim under the nuns Richarda and Gerburga, whom she describes as her "very kind and very wise mistresses." In a short historical notice of her prefixed to her works by Meibonius it is said that she succeeded Gerburga as novice-mistress. This writer, while admiring her as a poetess and dramatist, says, "She sinned so much in prosody, which is to be condoned on account of her sex."[3]

Very little seems to be known of her personally beyond the facts that she was very learned, especially in the Holy Scriptures; that she knew Greek as well as Latin, and that she was the authoress of six plays or religious dramas, a good many poems and a few prose writings, all of which were first published in the year 1501 by a German named Conrad Celt, who edited and dedicated them to Frederick III., Elector of Saxony. She wrote in mediæval Latin, and a glossary of some of her expressions is attached to her works. She dedicated her poems to her late mistress, Gerburga, who was at that time Abbess of Gandersheim. In her own preface to her dramas she says she wrote them because there were many Catholics who preferred to read profane writers such as Terence, whom they

[2] Orden Congregationen der Catholischenkirche. Heimbucher, p. 400, Vol. I

[3] Roswitha Paul et Winifred, 1902 Migne. Vol. CXXXVII. Pat. Lat., p. 942.

loved for the beauty of his style, to studying Holy Scripture, so she has attempted to afford them amusement and edification at the same time.

Possibly, nay, probably, her comedies, as she calls them, were acted in her monastery, but it appears to have been left to the twentieth century to produce any of them on a public stage, which is rather strange when we remember the popularity of the miracle-plays in the middle ages. Roswitha's dramas were all written in prose; the speeches are for the most part very short; very rarely do they exceed a few lines in length, and very often they consist of only a word or two, but these few words are very much to the point and are frequently as sharp as they are few. The scenes are proportionally short and none of the plays have more than one act, except "Gallicanus," the first in the book.

The scene of all the plays is laid in early Christian times—that of "Gallicanus" in the fourth century, under the Emperors Constantine and Julian the Apostate; "Dulcitius" in the third, under Diocletian; "Callimachus" in the first century; "Paphnutius" and "Abraham" in the fourth, and "Sapientia" in the second century, under the Emperor Adrian.

The plots of "Paphnutius," "Abraham" and "Sapientia" are founded on legends of the early Christians; these three plays are the most dramatic and the best constructed of the series. If the plays were written in the order in which they are arranged, these three, which are the last, show that the author gained both in dramatic power and in the technical knowledge of the art of playwriting as she proceeded in exercising her talent for it. "Gallicanus" is in two acts, and as the second act turns on a totally different subject from the first and savors of anti-climax, the play would have lost nothing had it ended with the fall of the curtain at the end of the first act.

Gallicanus is a pagan Roman general, a widower with two young daughters; he falls in love with Constantia, the daughter of the Emperor Constantine, a devout Christian girl, who has made a vow of perpetual chastity.

In the first scene Gallicanus approaches the Emperor very much as a twentieth century lover, if old-fashioned enough to do so, might approach a prospective father-in-law and ask his consent to his suit.

In scene II. Constantine apprises his daughter of the wishes of Gallicanus, not without much hesitation on his part, for as he tells her he fears to make her sad.

Constantia:[4] "I shall be sad if you do not tell me."

[4] Migne. Pat Lat. Tom. cxxxvii., pp. 975-987.

Constantine: "Gallicanus, the general whose frequent and successful victories have gained him the first rank among our Princes and whose skill is most often needed for the defense of our country——"

Constantia: "What of him?"

Constantine: "He desires to have you for his wife."

Constantia: "I prefer to die."

Constantine: "I foresaw it."

Constantia: "Nor is it remarkable when, with your consent and your permission, I devoted my virginity to the service of God."

Constantine: "I remember."

Constantia: "No torments will be able to compel me to consent, for I will keep my vow inviolate."

Constantine: "It is but right. But it places me in an exceedingly difficult position, because if from a paternal point of view I should consent to your perseverance in this purpose, I shall suffer no light loss in public affairs. But if I resist you, which God forbid, I shall suffer the pains of eternal torments."

Constantia: "But if I should despair of divine help, how exceedingly great would be my grief."

Constantine: "True."

Constantia: "But there is no place for sadness when we trust in the love of God."

Constantine: "How well you speak, my Constantia!"

Constantia: "If you will deign to take my advice now, you will be able to avoid both losses."

Constantia then proceeds to unfold to her father the scheme by which she hopes to convert Gallicanus to Christianity, and she urges the Emperor to pretend to Gallicanus that if he returns victorious from the expedition on which he is about to be sent, he may hope for her consent to his proposal. At the same time Constantine must persuade Gallicanus to leave his two daughters with her and take with him her two chief advisers, John and Paul. Constantine then inquires what he is to do if Gallicanus returns victorious from the war, and Constantia says they must pray to Almighty God to recall the mind of Gallicanus from the intention of marrying her.

Gallicanus consents to both these suggestions and goes to war with John and Paul in his train, leaving his daughters with Constantia, who very soon converts them to Christianity and induces them to consecrate themselves to Our Lord as she has done. In the meanwhile in the course of the expedition John and Paul convert Gallicanus, as Constantia had foreseen they would do, and when he comes back to Rome he tells the Emperor how he won the battle after he had made a vow to God at the persuasion of John and Paul.

Gallicanus:[5] "There appeared to me a beautiful youth, bearing on his shoulders a very large cross, and he ordered me to follow him with my sword drawn."

Constantine: "Whoever he was he was sent from heaven."

Gallicanus: "I understood that, and immediately there stood on my right hand and on my left armed soldiers whose faces I did not know in the least, and they promised me their help."

Constantine: "A celestial army."

Gallicanus: "I do not doubt it, but when I safely followed him preceding me into the midst of the enemy's lances, I arrived at the King, Braban by name, who, seized with terrible fear, cast himself at my feet and surrendered with all his men, promising to pay constant tribute to the Roman Empire in future."

Constantine: "I should like to know what became of the tribunes who deserted you at the beginning of the battle."

Gallicanus: "They returned begging to be reconciled and I proposed to them that whosoever should become a Christian should receive pardon and high honors, but whoever refused to become a Christian should receive no pardon and should be dismissed from the army."

Constantine: "A just proposal and consistent with your authority."

Gallicanus: "I indeed, being baptized, submitted myself entirely to God, renouncing your daughter, whom I loved above all things, so that I might please the Son of the Virgin."

Constantine: "Come nearer that I may embrace you. Now I must unfold to you what at the time I studied to hide from you."

Gallicanus: "What is that?"

Constantine: "That your daughters, through mine, have embraced the religion which you have chosen."

Gallicanus: "I rejoice."

Constantine: "And they burn with such a love of preserving their virginity that neither threats nor cajoling will be able to recall them from that intention."

Gallicanus: "Let them persevere. I consent."

Constantine: "Let us enter the palace, where they are awaiting us."

Gallicanus: "Proceed. I follow."

Constantine: "Behold! here they come to meet us with my mother, the glorious Empress, Helena, all weeping tears of joy."

Gallicanus: "Live happily, holy virgins! persevering in the fear of the Lord, and preserve inviolate the beauty of virginity, by which you shall be found worthy of the embraces of the eternal King."

Constantine: "Praise and glory be to Him Whom every creature ought to serve."

[5] *Ibid.*

Gallicanus: "I desire to go and join myself to the Holy Land, Hilanion in the city, and devote the rest of my life to praising God and serving the poor."

Constantine: "May He to Whom all things are possible grant thee grace to live near Him and bring thee to eternal happiness. Who reigns and is glorified in the Unity of the Trinity."

Gallicanus: "Amen."

Thus ends the first act. Some years are supposed to have elapsed between this and the second act, during which Julian the Apostate has come to the throne and a persecution of the Christians takes place, under which Gallicanus and the two priests who converted him, John and Paul, suffer martyrdom. We pass over the second play, "Dulcitius," which culminates in the martyrdom of three noble virgins, after some farcical scenes which are not very edifying, but which perhaps justified Roswitha in describing her plays as comedies, even when they end in a tragedy.

The third play, "Callimachus," is, we think, the least good of the series. The plot is very mediæval, and turns on the diabolical arts of a magician named Fortunatus, which are frustrated by St. John the Evangelist, who brings to life Callimachus and Drusiana, the wife of Andronicus, whom he unlawfully loved and whose prayer to die rather than consent to him was granted.

Following the legend of the fall and repentance of the hermit Abraham's niéce Mary, the plot of the play to which he gives his name is based upon that story. It opens with a scene between Abraham and another hermit named Ephraim, in which Abraham tells his brother-hermit how he has adopted a little orphan niece of eight years of age, and has given her money to the poor, and he now wants to persuade her to consecrate herself entirely to Our Lord and live in one of his cells as a recluse. He explains that he felt bound to do this because the child is named Mary after Our Lady. Ephraim fully approvse of the plan and agrees to try and instill into the mind of the child the beauty of celibacy. In scene II. the two hermits proceed to do this.

Abraham:[6] "O adopted daughter. O part of my soul, Mary! Yield to my paternal admonitions and to those of my companion Ephraim, that you should imitate the Virgin of Virgins, Mary, whose name you bear and shine as she does in the beauty of chastity."

Ephraim: "It is very unfit, O daughter, that thou who are preëminent with the Mother of God through the mystery of her name. Mary, among the stars which never set, should revolve inferior in merit upon the earth."

[6] Migne. *Ibid.*, p. 1,016. et seq.

Mary: "I am ignorant of the meaning of the name, so I do not understand what all this mysterious conversation means."

Ephraim: "Mary is interpreted Star of the Sea, round which the world is borne."

Mary: "Why is it called Star of the Sea?"

Ephraim: "Because it never sets, but directs mariners in the right path on their voyage."

Mary: "And how is it possible that such a little girl as I, made of dust and ashes, should ever attain such merits as shine in the mystery of my name?"

Ephraim: "By immaculate purity of the body and perfect holiness of mind."

Mary: "Great is the honor for man to be equal to the rays of the stars."

Ephraim: "But if thou wilt remain a virgin, thou wilt be made equal to the angels of God, guarded by whom, when at length having cast off the heavy weight of the body in passing through the air, thou shalt step above the ether, thou shalt run through the zodiac, nor shalt thou delay a step by standing still until thou art folded in the embrace of the Son of the Virgin, in the illuminated bridal-chamber of His Mother."

Mary: "Who despises such things lives like the brutes. I therefore despise this present world. I deny myself the same, that I may merit to be enrolled among those who enjoy the joys of such great felicity."

Ephraim: "Behold we have met with the mature wisdom of an old mind in the breast of an infant."

Abraham: "Thanks be to God that it is so. I will make her a narrow cell close to the entrance to my own little house, through the window of which I will instruct her in the Psalter and in other pages of the divine law, and I will visit her very frequently."

Ephraim: "I agree to that."

Mary: "To thy prayers, Father Ephraim, I commend myself."

Ephraim: "May the Celestial Spouse, to whom thou hast given thyself in this tender age, protect thee from all fraud of the devil."

An interval of twenty years is supposed to have elapsed between the first and second scenes, which time Mary has passed enclosed in this cell, but at length corrupted by a man disguised as a monk, she fell, and despairing of pardon, fled to the world, escaping through the window of her cell and is now living an immoral life. In scene III, Abraham relates the story to his friend Ephraim and consults him about it.

Abraham: "Brother Ephraim, if anything good or bad happens to me, it is to you that I come first; you only do I consult. There-

fore, do not oppose what I propose to do now, but help me to bear the grief which I suffer."

Ephraim: "Abraham, Abraham, what dost thou suffer? Why art thou more sad than it is lawful to be? Never was it the lawful custom of a hermit to be troubled in a worldly manner."

Abraham: "An incomparable sorrow has happened to me—an intolerable grief afflicts me."

Ephraim: "Don't trouble me with a long preamble, but explain what you are suffering."

Abraham: "Mary, my adopted daughter, who for twenty years I have cared for with the greatest diligence and instructed with the greatest care——"

Ephraim: "What of her?"

Abraham: "Alas! woe is me; she perishes."

Ephraim: "In what way?"

Abraham: "Miserably; she has escaped from hence."

Ephraim: "With what snares has the fraud of the old serpent led her astray?"

Abraham then relates the story of Mary's fall and subsequent despair and consequent flight, and his horror when he discovers that she has fled, which Ephraim shares in listening to the tale. Abraham then unfolds the plan by which he hopes to rescue his lamb from the wolf who has stolen her and bring back his wounded dove to her nest, and incidentally he tells Ephraim of a vision he has had, by means of which he has discovered his loss.

Ephraim inquires if he has any idea where Mary is, and Abraham says he has a friend in the city, who will not rest until he has found her, and he then proposes to put off his hermit's habit and disguising himself as a young man of the world, go and seek his strayed lamb, and bring her back to the fold..

Ephraim approves of the plan and will pray for its success.

In the next scene Abraham learns from his friend where Mary is to be found, and in the next scene, disguised as a lover, he interviews his unfortunate niece, and ultimately succeeds in persuading her to return with him and abandon her present sinful life.

Abraham:[7] "Behold thy deserted cell."

Mary: "Alas, it is conscious of my wickedness and so I fear to enter."

Abraham: "And rightly. The place is indeed to be feared in which victory followed the enemy."

Mary: "Where, then, dost thou intend me to live in penance?"

Abraham: "Go into the inner cell, lest the old serpent should find another occasion of deceiving thee."

[7] Migne. *Ibid.*

Mary: "I do not struggle against it, but what thou commandest I obey."

Abraham: "I will go to my friend Ephraim, that he who alone condoled with me in my loss may rejoice that I have found thee."

The concluding scene is between the two hermits, who discuss the life of severe penance which Mary is to lead for the rest of her life, and which according to the legend she did lead for twenty years.

The plot of "Paphnutius" is very similar to that of "Abraham," and concerns the beautiful penitent Thais, so renowned for her beauty and for the luxury in which she lived. Paphnutius is a priest, who conceives the idea of disguising himself as one of her lovers and thus gaining entrance to her house, persuades her to abandon her wicked life and retire into a cell attached to a convent, where for three years she lives a life of exemplary penance and dies a happy death. In this play Roswitha has followed the story of the life of Thais as told in lives of the saints, and puts into the mouth of Paphnutius the words of the only prayer she was permitted to use, "Thou who hast made me, have mercy upon me," when she asks him how she, a very great sinner, is to address Almighty God.

"Sapientia," the last of the series of plays, is founded upon the legend of St. Sophia, a noble Greek widow with three young daughters, named Faith, Hope and Charity, all of whom were martyred under Adrian. The plot is concerned with the arguments between Sapientia and her daughters on the one side and the Emperor and his chief Senator on the other, as the latter endeavors to persuade these Christian women to sacrifice to the gods.

It is the most suitable of all the plays for production on a convent stage, and is with "Gallicanus" quite free from any of the unpleasant situations and scenes which characterize the four others. In "Dulcitius" and "Callimachus" the authoress introduced witchcraft and sorcery. In this last play she puts into the mouth of Sapientia some of the clumsy arithmetical modes of notation which were current in the time of Roswitha, before the introduction of the Arabic system in the year 1200. The Greeks were cleverer arithmeticians and mathematicians than the Romans, and so Roswitha makes Sapientia instruct the Emperor in the relations of quantities and numbers and magnitudes, and makes Adrian astonished at her learning and the subtlety of her arguments. The play opens with a scene between the Emperor and Andronicus, the chief Senator, in which the latter informs Adrian of the presence in Rome of Sapientia and her daughters, and of the dangers they are to the State on account of their religion, to which they are

making many converts, especially among the wives of the Senators and officers, which Adrian agrees with Andronicus is very inconvenient. In the following scenes Sapientia and her daughters are summoned to Adrian's presence, that he may persaude them first by flattery and then by threats to sacrifice to the gods.

Andronicus:[8] "This is the Emperor whom you behold sitting on his throne. Take heed what you say to him."

Sapientia: "The saying of Christ forbids this. He promises to give us the gift of insuperable wisdom."

Adrian: "Where are these little women whom thou hast denounced as Christians?"

Andronicus: "They are here before you."

Adrian: "I am confounded by the beauty of every one of them, but I do not know how sufficiently to admire the nobility of their demeanor."

Andronicus: "Desist, your Majesty, from admiring them and command them to sacrifice to the gods."

Adrian: "What if I first approach them with flattering speeches? Perhaps they may be willing to yield."

Andronicus: "It is better; for the weakness of the feminine sex is more easily overcome by flattery."

Adrian: "Illustrious matron, I invite you gently and quietly to sacrifice to the gods, by which you may obtain my friendship."

Sapientia: "I do not desire greatly either to satisfy your wishes by sacrificing to the gods or to enjoy your friendship."

Adrian: "I am still moved with mitigated fury in my indignation against you, but for your own and your daughters' sakes, I implore you to do so with paternal love."

Sapientia: "Be unwilling, oh! my daughters, to offer your hearts to the alluring words of this serpent of Satan, but scorn them together with me."

Faith: "We scorn and condemn such frivolity with all our souls."

Adrian: "What are you murmuring about?"

Sapientia: "I am speaking a few words to my daughters."

Adrian: "You appear evidently to have sprung from the highest birth; nevertheless, I should like to learn more fully your country, race and name."

Sapientia: "It is not lawful for us to take pride in our noble blood, but I nevertheless cannot deny my origin is from an illustrious race, for very eminent Greek princes were my parents, and I am called Sapientia."

Adrian: "The love of frankness shines on your face, and the wisdom of your name is in your mouth."

[8] Migne. *Ibid.*, p. 1,048 et seq.

Sapientia: "In vain these flattering words, for we shall not yield to your persuasion."

Adrian: "Tell me why you are here and why you have come to our country."

Sapientia: "For nothing else except to confess the truth by which I may more easily teach the faith which you are fighting against and consecrate my daughters to Christ."

Adrian: "Explain the names of each of them."

Sapientia: "This is Faith, the other is Hope and the third is Charity."

Adrian: "What are their ages?"

Sapientia (aside): "Does it please you, my daughters, that I should trouble this fool with an arithmetical disputation?"

Faith: "Certainly, mother. We shall listen with pleasure to it."

Sapientia then proceeds to inflict upon the Emperor a mathematical lecture, which we spare the reader. At the close of it Adrian again urges them to sacrifice to the gods, and threatens them with torture and death if they refuse, and orders them to be placed in a prison near his palace for three days, and if at the end of that time they still refuse, they are to be handed to the executioners.

The next scene is in the prison between Sapientia and her children.

Sapientia: "Oh, my sweet daughters and dear children, do not be saddened by the narrowness of this prison and be not terrified by his threats of imminent punishment."

Faith: "It is possible that our little bodies may tremble with fear at the torments, but our minds earnestly desire the rewards."

Sapientia: "Conquer the fear of your youthful age by the fortitude of mature reason."

Faith: "It is your part to help us with your prayers, that we may be able to conquer."

Sapientia: "This I pray for without ceasing; this I implore, that you may persevere in the faith which from your cradles I have not desisted from instilling into your minds."

Faith: "What we learned as babes and sucklings we shall never forget."

Sapientia: "For this I nourished you at the breast, for this I brought you up delicately, that I might give you not to an earthly, but to a celestial Spouse, so that I might merit for your sakes to be called the mother-in-law of the eternal King."

Faith: "For the love of this Spouse we are ready to die."

Sapientia: "I am more delighted at your wisdom, oh! my daughters, than I should be with the taste of the sweetest nectar."

Faith: "Send us before the tribunal of the Judge and you will experience how much courage His love will bring us."

Sapientia: "This I desire, that I may be crowned by your virginity and glorified by your martyrdom."

Charity: "We will go with joined hands and confound the face of this tyrant."

Sapientia: "Wait until the hour comes in which you will be summoned to him."

Faith: "Delay is tedious, but nevertheless we will wait."

The next scene is in the throne room, whither Sapienttia and her children are brought before the Emperor by Andronicus, who tells Adrian they are determined to persevere in their obstinacy, and urges the Emperor to deliver them to the torturers.

Adrian: "Faith, look upon the image of the great Diana, and offer sacrifice to the great goddess, that you may win her favor."

Faith: "Oh! foolish precept of an Emperor, worthy of all contempt."

Adrian: "What are your murmuring and whispering? Whom are you scoffing and frowning at?"

Faith: "I scoff at your foolishness.. I laugh at your folly."

Adrian: "At mine?"

Faith: "At yours."

Andronicus: "At the Emperor's?"

Faith: "At his."

Andronicus: "Oh! wickedness."

Faith: "Yes, for what can be more foolish, what could be seen more idiotic than what he is exhorting us to do? To dishonor the Creator of all things by offering veneration to metals!"

Andronicus: "Is not this rather the greatest madness and the most extreme folly to say that the Emperor, the prince of all things, is foolish?"

Faith: "I said it, and I say it, and I shall say it as long as I shall live."

Andronicus: "You will not live long; death will soon be your portion."

Faith: "This I desire that I may die in Christ."

Adrian: "Twelve centurions shall alternately beat you with scourges. Oh, strongest centurions, come hither and avenge my injuries!"

Faith is removed by the centurions, and after an interval Andronicus is sent to see if she has yielded and to bring her back.

Andronicus: "Come hither, Faith. Are you still inclined to insult the Emperor with your jests?"

Faith: "Why should I be less inclined?"

Andronicus: "Because you have been prohibited by whips."

Faith: "Whips won't make me silent, for I felt no pain."

Andronicus: "Oh, miserable pertinacity! Oh, contumacious audacity!"

Adrian: "Her body is wearied with torments, but her mind is swelled with pride."

Faith: "You err, Adrian, if you think to wear me out with torments. For not I, in sooth, but the weak torturers fainted with fatigue."

Adrian: "Let her be placed on a gridiron with a fire burning underneath, that she may be almost killed by the power of the smoke."

Andronicus: "She deserves to perish miserably when she does not fear to struggle against your commands."

Faith: "All that your prepare for my suffering is turned into peacefulness. I rest as comfortably on the gridiron as if I were in a boat on a calm sea."

Adrian: "Let a frying-pan full of pitch and wax and burning oils be set over the fire, and into this boiling liquor let this rebel be placed."

Faith: "I leap into it willingly."

Adrian: "With my consent."

Faith: "Where are now your threats? Behold, I swim unhurt, playing in this burning liquor, and instead of heat I feel only the refreshing coolness of the morning dew."

Adrian: "What is to be done with her now, Andronicus? Let her head be cut off. There is no other way of conquering her."

Faith: "Now let us rejoice, now let us exult in the Lord."

Sapientia: "Oh, Christ! Victor of the devil, give the patience of Faith to my daughter."

Faith: "Oh, venerable mother! Say farewell at last to your daughter; give a kiss to your first-born; be not afflicted with any sadness, because I am going to eternal joys."

Sapientia: "Oh, daughter, daughter, I am not disturbed, I am not saddened, but exulting I say farewell to thee, and I kiss your eyes and mouth weeping for joy, that you are keeping the mystery of your name inviolate under the sword of the persecutor."

Faith: "Oh, my sisters, give me the kiss of peace and prepare yourselves to bear the coming struggle."

Hope: "Help us with earnest prayer, that we may merit to follow in your footsteps."

Faith: "Be obedient to the admonitions of our holy parent, who has exhorted us to scorn the things of this world, that we may merit to attain eternal joys."

Charity: "We willingly obey the advice of our mother, by which we may merit to enjoy eternal happiness."

Faith: "Executioner, come hither and fulfill the office enjoined upon thee by killing me."

Sapientia: "In embracing the head of my dying daughter, and kissing it frequently with my lips, O Christ, I congratulate Thee who hast given the victory to such a little girl."

Adrian: "Hope, yield to my exhortations counselling you with paternal affection."

Hope: "What do you advise? What do you exhort me to do?"

Adrian: "To beware of imitating the pertinacity of your sister, lest you should undergo similar torments."

Hope: "Oh, would that I could merit to imitate her in suffering, so that I might be like her in the reward."

Adrian: "Put off this hardness of heart and offer incense to the great Diana, and I will cherish you like my own child and love you like a father."

Hope: "I repudiate your paternity, and do not in the least desire your benefits. On which account you deceive yourself with a vain hope if you expect me to yield."

Adrian: "Speak less or you will make me angry."

Hope: "Be angry. I do not care."

Andronicus: "I am surprised, oh, august Emperor, that you should suffer yourself to be calumniated by this vile little girl for so long. I am bursting with anger in listening to her railing against you with such rashness."

Adrian: "Till now I spared her extreme youth; I spare her no longer, but hand her over to just vengeance. Oh, lictors, come and beat this rebel with fierce whips to death."

Andronicus: "It is fitting that she should feel the severity of your anger, because she thinks little of the mildness of your paternal affection."

Hope: "I desire this mildness."

Andronicus: "Oh, Sapientia, what are you murmuring about, standing with upraised eyes near the corpse of your dead child?"

Sapientia: "I am invoking the Father of all things, that He may grant to Hope the same perseverance in suffering that He gave to Faith."

Hope: "Oh, mother, mother, how efficacious do I feel your prayers to be. Behold, angels with raised right hands counterbalance each stroke, and I feel no touch of pain."

Adrian: "If you make so little of whips, you shall be compelled with sharper pains."

Hope: "Bring something more cruel. Think of something mortal. The more you rage the more will you be confounded by being conquered."

Adrian: "Let her be suspended in the air and torn with nails, until her bones are naked and she is broken asunder limb from limb."

Faith is removed, and these and other torments proving futile, Adriant at last orders her to be beheaded.

Hope: "Oh, Charity! my beloved and now my only sister! Do not fear the threats of this tyrant nor the pains. Try with the constancy of faith to imitate your sisters preceding you to the heavenly palace."

Charity: "I am weary of this present life. I am tired of this earthly habitation because I am separated from you even for this little time."

Hope: "Illustrious mother! rejoice and do not let your heart be touched by maternal grief at my suffering, but set hope before lamentation when you see me die for Christ."

Sapientia: "Now indeed I rejoice, but then at length I shall rejoice perfectly, when I shall send you to heaven with your dead sister, equal to her in courage, and I myself shall very soon follow you."

Hope: "May the Blessed Trinity restore thee in eternity the full number of thy children without any diminution."

Sapientia: "Be strong, my daughter. Here is the executioner with his unsheathed sword."

Hope: "Gladly I welcome the sword. Do thou, O Christ, receive my spirit."

Sapientia: "Oh, Charity! my one remaining hope! do not sadden thy mother waiting for the end of your struggle, but scorn this present world so that you may attain the eternal joy in which your sisters shine with crowns of undefiled virginity."

Adrian: "Charity, say only 'Great Diana' and I will not compel you to any further sacrifice."

Charity: "I most certainly shall not say it."

Adrian: "Why not?"

Charity: "Because I will not tell a lie. I indeed, with my sisters, was born of the same parents, and imbued with the same sacraments, and strengthened together with them in the constancy of the same faith. Wherefore, know us to will, to feel, to know and to be one and the same, neither will I in anything be different from them."

Adrian: "Oh, shame that I should be scorned by such a little girl. Let her be taken away and beaten atrociously, and if that does not prevail, let a furnace be heated for three days and let her be cast into it."

Charity is now removed, and presently Andronicus comes to tell

the Emperor that neither the whips nor the flames could hurt the child in the least, but, on the contrary, when Charity was cast into the furnace she played about in the fire, but the flames burst out and destroyed five thousand men; whereupon they agree that nothing remains but to behead her without delay. In the last scene Sapientia is found at the tomb of her three daughters by some Roman matrons, who endeavor to comfort her, and her concluding and dying speech is the only long one in the play, and is a prayer.

The above is a summary of Roswitha's dramatic works. She also wrote eight poems, one on the life of Our Lady, one on the Ascension of Our Lord, one on the martyrdom of St. Gandolf, another on the martyrdom of St. Pelagius, one on the fall and conversion of Theophilus, another on the conversion of Proterius, one on the martyrdom of St. Dionysius, a longer one called "A Song of the Foundation of the Monastery of Gandersheim" and another song on the Emperor Otto I.

She also wrote a prose life of the first abbess of Gandersheim, Hathumoda, and a rhymed dialogue on her death.

DARLEY DALE.

PRAGMATISM AND THE PROBLEM OF THE IDEA.

PRAGMATISM is best described as a point of view which is based on definite postulates and is expressed in a distinctive way of regarding mental life and conduct. As a point of view it is looking away from first principles and looking to results, which it terms facts. Hence it claims to be an empirical tendency. The point of view is shown in its theory of truth, its explanation of mental life and in its teaching on the relation of thought to reality. Thus its doctrines have been summed up and set forth in three phases: in Psychology by Professor James, who calls his system Radical Empiricism; in logic by Professor Dewey, who proclaims Instrumentalism, and in metaphysics by Professors Royce, who claims to be an Absolute Pragmatist; Schiller, who teaches Humanism, and Bergson, who is known as the Apostle of Creative Evolution. The present article is confined to the psychological and logiacl phases which deal principally with the theory of truth and the explation of mental life.

I. POSTULATES OF PRAGMATISM.

Pragmatism can be understood only by viewing it against a background which it accepts without question. In origin it is a reaction against the extravagant idealism of the nine-

teenth century. With the reaction went a leaning to and an acceptance of the empirical stream of nineteenth century thought. To this it added its sole characteristic doctrine: insistence on mental activity, which is viewed as a unifying principle for the empiric background. In the background are found the postulates or assumptions of Pragmatism. The more important of these are: Sensism, Evolution and a so-called Scientific Method.

1. Phenomenal Idealism of Sensism is the basic postulate of Pragmatism. Sense-experience is held to be the source and material of all knowledge. Therefore the objects of knowledge are not *things,* nor the real appearance of things, but their appearances as they are viewed within the mind. Thus Professor James holds that our whole conception of an object consists of "sensations and their reactions," and that "ideas themselves are but parts of our experience." To confound ideas with sensations by denying a distinction between the two is *Sensism,* just as to say that the mental appearances are the object of knowledge is *Phenomenal Idealism.* Again he writes that things are not what they are, but only what and as "they are *known as,*" and "for us they are not different if they make no difference." But this is the false principle of the *Relativity of knowledge* added to the *Idealism.* Moreover, he tells us that we cannot know substances, either material or spiritual, as such. But this is *Agnosticism.* Besides, to say that "substance is a spurious idea," that it is only "the name for a group of sensations," because phenomena come to us "as groups of sensations," is to propose the false teaching of *Nominalism;* i. e., our conceptions of things are names only. With Professor Dewey "experience" is the sum and substance of knowledge and of mental life. He denies an ontological distinction between thought and its material, and says this distinction is "within experience" and then only "an economic distinction" to show "a division of labor." Hence the material or subject-matter of thought is not outside of and distinct from the mind. Again he writes that "the distinctions between mind and body and their alleged disparateness and supposed parallelism are a pseudo-problem created by a prejudiced metaphysics." Thus the facts with which Pragmatism deals are mental facts; not things, but the perceptions of things; not God, but belief in God; not an external world, but belief in an external world. God and the external world exist for the Pragmatist only because and in so far as these beliefs have the marks of a true belief. Hence God and the external world are known only as inferred from the beliefs.

2. Evolution is the construction or integrating postulate of Pragmatism. The world, i. e., experience, is an evolutive process. Professor James rejects Absolute Monism and Absolute Pluralism. To him the

world is one in so far as its parts hang together by any definite connection; it is many just so far as any definite connection fails to obtain; and adds that "it is growing more and more united by those systems of connection which human energy keeps forming as time goes on." Professor Dewey holds that the evolution process is *of* experience and *in* experience, and writes, "Reality must be defined in terms of experience, and judgment appears as the medium through which the consciously effected evolution of Reality goes on." Hence thought is not a mere product, but an organic factor in the process. Thus the difference between mind and matter, subject and object, does not mean the existence of two separate and naturally exclusive worlds, but the rich potentiality, the creative activity of one. But this is *Ideal Monism.* Reality, therefore, does not exist outside the mind. It consists in the mental process of making or remaking the world, i. e., experience. Hence evolution is an essential character of Reality and Reality is change. This fact that "experience" is undergoing change in the evolution process is the Pragmatic doctrine that Reality, i. e., Being, is plastic. Experience is conceived as self-supporting and self-propelling. Thus the principle of *continuity* is assumed. Reality, i. e., experience, is not conceived as individual experience, but as social. Hence the evolution is described as a social process, of which the individual experience or reality is a part. Moreover, Pragmatism holds that Darwin showed the existence of purpose, and hence teaches that the evolution-process is *purposive* or teleogical. In criticism it can be said that the evolution postulate is a pure assumption. Reality is not what is *known as,* nor is it merely the product of our thought. Realities exist without reference to our minds. The mind finds realities and must conform to them. It is true I can combine realities, e. g., build a house, or dissociate them, e. g., in chemical analysis, but I must conform to certain laws having reference to their properties and action. To make the knowledge of realities constitute realities is idealism. The familiar story of the nine blind men and the elephant comes in illustration. Many realities exist without being *known as* such and exert an influence upon our lives, e. g., the composition of the atmosphere. Again we are told that private and social consciousness make up experience, but Professor James assures us that experience only becomes experience when *known as,* and what is *known as* does not exist. Moreover, to set forth evolution as a world-process, whether real or ideal, is the extreme of metaphysics, although Professor Dewey is fond of ridiculing metaphysics. Darwinian evolution is discredited by scientists of to-day. The only element of truth in Darwin's system is the fact of growth. He showed that growth is a law of life. But the processes of growth depend upon the nature

of the life. The mind grows, but not like the body; Phychology is not Physiology. The body grows, but not like the tree; Physiology is not Botany. The only real advance in Biology within fifty years is Mendel's Law verified of vegetable life only. And Professor Bateson, of Oxford, asserts that had Darwin known of this law, the Origin of Species would not have been written. To conceive the abstract fact of Growth as an integrating principle in a world-process is a pure assumption in contradiction to established truths. Even Professor James holds that the perception of *sameness* in kind is a category of common sense, and according to him the one first discovered and used by our lowest ancestors. But how can we recognize *sameness* in kind in an ever-changing process of development where the "experience" is ever plastic and thinking of a thing means its "real modification" with Professor Dewey, or its "transformation" with Professor James, so that "the future may not identically repeat and imitate the past?" 3. A so-called Scientific Method is the instrumental postulate of Pragmatism. This method is the application of the working-hypothesis of modern science to mental life. Evolution explains the "going," the working-hypothesis gives us the instrument of the "going" and unfolds the technique of the process. The working-hypothesis of science is a "device" or "working-formula" for dealing with scientific problems and accepted provisionally if it does the work. In like manner all our theories are viewed as "leadings," "instruments for use," "modes of adaptation" to the Reality which is conceived to be in the solution of the mental problem. The sole question in the mind of the Pragmatist is not that the theory or the "idea" with Professor James or the "judgment process" with Professor Dewey be true or false, but will it "work?" The theory is adopted simply for that reason and for that alone. Its value consists in its working quality, and this consists in its adaptability for undergoing real variation in the evolutive reconstruction of experience. Thus, in the sense that it is a useful instrument, the idea becomes a mediating factor or function in the process. In criticism we say that men of science explicitly contrast working-hypotheses with established truths and give provisional assent only to the former. It is *Skepticism* to hold that all scientific theories are purely working-hypotheses, and it is false to apply the working-hypothesis to mental life and call it a scientific method. Finally, science deals with actual existing things, not with group-sensations.

II. THE THEORY OF TRUTH.

Pragmatism tests the truth of a notion by its respective practical consequences. Truth with Professor James is what is "useful" or "expedient;" with Professor Dewey what is "instrumental" for

"satisfaction." Hence truth is relative to the person: what is useful to me may not be useful to you, and what is useful to me to-day may not be useful to-morrow. Thus truth changes with persons, times and places. But this is Skepticism and destroys the bases of physical science. Again, Professor James asks what difference it would practically make to any one if this notion rather than that were true, and answers, "If no difference, the alternative means practically the same." But this is *Subjectivism* and is contradicted by the history of development in every branch of science. We distinguish *pure* science from *applied* science. The truths of pure science are discovered and verified before they are applied to the practical uses of life. Again, practical significance may be real or apparent, actual or possible. Yet I do not know the possible practical significance of all things. To make my present knowledge or needs the test of truth is the ego-centric doctrine in an extreme form. But Pragmatism cannot avoid the difficulty, for its basic postulate is "experience." Truth is conceived as working within "experience." Hence experience must find within itself the source and support of its values of truth and error. Thus Professor James holds that objective truth, i. e., apart from its function in our experience, is not to be found.

2. As experience is the basis upon which the theory of Truth rests, so the evolutive-process furnishes the test of its value. An idea is true if it works, and it works if, in the constant evolutive reconstruction of experience, it is successful in bringing one part of experience in touch with another part, especially in mediating between old opinions and new experience, so as to cause the least possible jolt in the blending. Hence truth is not a property inherent in the idea: it marks the success and efficiency of the idea as a useful instrument. This is the theory of Instrumentalism proposed by Professor Dewey. The working is prompted by needs, hence it is true for a special purpose. But to assume that the satisfaction of needs is desirable and necessary is perfectionism in its most flagrant form, although Pragmatists are fond of ridiculing Perfectionism. Not all our needs or desires should be satisfied, and, with many, restraint should be used. Temperance in thought and action is a cardinal virtue. Discipline of thought and character is the basic principle in education. Hence there is a difference of value in needs and desires. If the value of truth consists merely in the efficiency of work, where is the standard for the difference of value in needs and desires? The act of the idea to Pragmatists, not the idea itself, is true, and it is true in so far as it functions or is an adaptation in the evolutive process of experience. Its truth is its utility as a means to an end. An idea is true because it makes itself true by an efficient

discharge of its mediating function as an organic part of the process of real change in a developing world. Thus with Professor James the true is only "the expedient" in the way of our thinking, just as the right is only the expedient "in the way of our behaving." As ends constantly change in the experiencing-process, so do the purposes change, and with the change of purposes comes the corresponding constant changing of the means when judged by the test of expediency. With the change in means goes a corresponding change in truth. What may be true, i. e., expedient and useful to-day, may to-morrow be false, i. e., inexpedient and useless. The ends and means change, because the means, in working, effect a change in the contents of experience. This is the Pragmatic Doctrine of the *Plasticity* of Truth. Thus as the postulate of evolution teaches a plasticity of being so, when viewed as the background of Truth, does it teach a plasticity of Truth. Professor James calls Absolute Truth, i. e., what no further experience will ever alter, "that ideal vanishing-point towards which we imagine all our temporary truths will some day converge." Nothing is stable in this teaching. Yet there are stable elements in the physical, mental and moral worlds. These do not impede, but guide and serve action. Orderly activity supposes them. Otherwise science could not exist. The very basis and structural elements of a science are made up of definite fixed principles or laws.

3. Thus truth as a mental activity appears in the form of a working-hypothesis, with no guide or test except the measure of success which it achieves for the time being. The measure of success justifies its use and it is useful "in so far forth" as it succeeds. Applied to business life, this principle implies, if not dishonesty, at least *sharp practice*. Applied to politics, it does not set forth a high, true ideal of citizenship, but is very welcome to the "grafter." Applied to moral life, it teaches that the *end justifies the means*. As a working-hypothesis, the idea appears as a process, a plan of action, and a process which is only approximately true. Hence there are grades in truth. Some truths are truer than others, i. e., if they are more useful instruments for the work. If better instruments are found or invented, the old truths, like old clothes, are outworn and discarded, unless a practical mother makes them over for the rising heir. Professor Dewey teaches that truth is what is "instrumental" for "satisfaction," and Professor James says that "individuals will emphasize their points of satisfaction differently." In criticism we say that science holds data true prior to the process, hence they are true in some other sense than by being satisfactory. Besides, some truths are not satisfactory just because they are true. Again, men of science distinguish between established truths and working hy-

potheses. In taking the latter to illustrate mental activity, Pragmatism assumes as its method that which in science is regarded as giving the least assurance that truth is present at all. Again, a lie may be useful at times; if useful, it is true. Moreover, to tell the truth may not be useful or expedient, hence the truth may not be true. The Pragmatist is ever asking the question, What is there in this for me? Thus Professor James says that "we cannot reject any hypothesis if consequences useful to life flow from it." Yet in fact error, delusion and deception appealing to human needs and purposes are at times effective in directing human life and conduct.

Thus, while the Postulates of Pragmatism furnish the setting for the Theory of Truth and enable us to see how it works, yet the theory itself is clearly grasped only when viewed as the positive expression of the sole characteristic doctrine of Pragmatism, viz., its explanation of mental life which sets forth the "idea" or the "judgment process" as a purposive action, thereby combining mind and will in one act. Hence truth with them is not the correspondence of an idea within the mind to an object outside the mind, but consists in the efficacy of the "idea" or "judgment" as a means or instrument to an end. The end, constantly changing with the constant changing subject-matter or experience, is the ever-present purposive reconstruction of the experience within the mind. The successful working, at best approximate only, and different with different persons, or with the same person at each succeeding moment, is the reconstruction of experience, and this is viewed as reality because it is the effect or result of mental action. Thus to Pragmatists Truth is the relation or the correspondence of the idea or judgment to reality, i. e., the mental effect which it produces. Therefore the postulates, in furnishing the setting for the Pragmatic theory of Truth, are not accepted because they are true in themselves. In fact, they are pure assumptions and considered as true by Pragmatists "inasmuch" and "in so far forth" as they are "useful" or "expedient" for the working presentation of the theory.

III. THE PROBLEM OF THOUGHT.

With Professor Dewey the heart of the knowing problem is the relation of thought to its empirical antecedents and to its consequent, i. e., truth, and the relation of both to Reality. To him Reality is not viewed as self-existent outside the mind; it is experience undergoing reconstruction in and through the judgment process. Therefore mental life contains no entity as "soul" or "mind," but is "a stream of consciousness" compounded of "instincts," "interests" or "impulses." Hence he defines psychology as the natural history of the various attitudes and structures through

which experiencing passes as mental states in the stream of consciousness. Thus experience is the general term for mental activity; "habit," "attention," "consciousness" are particular works or functions of that activity. Experience first comes to the mind unorganized; as such, with Professor Dewey, it is not knowledge, for knowledge he conceives to be organized or reconstructed experience, and as this reconstruction takes place in the judgment-process, there is no knowledge outside of the judgment. "Fact" and "idea" are distinctions within experience, and as such are parts of experience viewed as different simply because they act or function in a different manner; the "fact" is the object within the mind, the "idea" is its meaning. The antecedents of thought are not knowledge: only *stimuli* to knowledge. Hence Professor Dewey says that "the simple idea of sensation is without objective reference;" that "what is perceived immediately is that part of the datum in the mind which is the object of attention;" that "objectivity consists in actually being the object of thought," for "what I do not think about is not objective," and to be the object of thought is what is "isolated in the stream of conscious experience by attention with a view to the attainment of a purpose." Thus "things are apprehended as objective in virtue of the agent's attitude to them; they are not objective antecedent to his attitude." In like manner Professor James tells us that things are "as they are known as." Therefore the basis of mental life is Phenomenal Idealism. In criticism is can be said that objectivity is defined in a partial and erroneous sense. It is true a mental state may be the object of thought as in meditation. Yet a thing existing outside the mind can be the object of thought, e. g., a child playing with blocks, my friend at solitaire, or a scientist in the laboratory is dealing with real objective things. Again, the objects within the mind came wholly or in part from the outside world. Therefore the term objective primarily and essentially refers to things existing outside the mind. Pragmatism confines the use of the term objective to mental states and makes the distinction between objective and subjective a distinction within the mind because its teaching is based on mental experience, and holds that mental experience is the sole subject-matter of thought. But this contention is contradicted by the happenings of ordinary daily life. Moreover, Pragmatism assumes mental experience as the subject-matter of thought because it denies immediate knowledge of things external to the mind. Yet Professor Dewey admits that mental "actions are suggested by consciously recognized stimuli" and that the external "object, e. g., a stone, must have a certain meaning as a stimulus first of all."[1] These admissions overturn the foundation of his

[1] "Studies in Logical Theory," pp. 251, 256.

system. The "conscious recognition of stimuli" and the apprehension of their "meaning" is knowledge. This knowledge may not be classified or as complete as that found in the judgment-process, but there can be grades or degrees of knowledge, and even Professor Dewey says that the knowledge of the judgment-process is not final, but provisional only. Hence it is a contradiction to confine knowledge to the judgment-process and admit that we grasp the "meaning" of what stimulates the process.

Thought for Pragmatism is the name for the process in which instincts and their appreciations interact and reconstruct themselves under the guidance of purpose with a view to conscious control. As ideal experience is the basic postulate of mental life, so evolution is the integrating postulate. The first stage of the process arises in inner "distractions" or "tensions" produced by needs of the mental situation. The process is active throughout and is described as a constant movement toward a defined equilibrium or reorganization which is viewed as the fulfillment of the purpose. The "idea" is derived from the situation and mediates as "a plan of action" in readjusting the conflicting elements. This is known as "the conflict-mediatorial" theory of thought. Mind or Consciousness is what it *seems* to be, viz., a transition-phase of the contents of experience undergoing reconstruction into something else. In this view experience is conceived as dynamic and self-evolving in specific conditions determined and controlled by the specific purposes. Knowledge therefore is not a state, i. e., stable, but an action: it is knowing for the present plan or purpose, and the act of knowing is set forth in Biological terms. Thus Professor Dewey says that Logical Theory is an account of thinking as a mode of adaptation and judges its validity by the consequences, i. e., its efficiency in meeting the problem. This view of thought as a dynamic teleological evolution effecting ever-constant change in reality brings out the fundamental doctrine in the Pragmatic Theory of Thought, viz., the definition of thought as *purposive action,* and purposive action is conduct, a definition which identifies thought and will and denies any distinction between them. The source of this doctrine is found in the development of modern Psychology. Just as modern Sociology differs from the Sociology of Spencer in this that it takes the Sociology of Spencer, which is structural merely and views it as functional, so that writers hold that modern Sociology begins where Spencer's Sociology ends, in like manner a change in the point of view has taken place in Psychology. The Psychology of Spencer, Bain and Mill is based on evolution, but is structural only. This structural Psychology is now viewed as functional and its basic element of evolution is regarded as functioning. The evolutive functioning of

experience is expressed in the dynamic action of thought, which can be so conceived only by identifying thought and will. The identification becomes necessary from the fact that purpose is now admitted to rule in the world. Thus we can understand why Professor Dewey aims to set forth the natural history of thought, i. e., after Spencer; why he seeks its beginnings in conflict, i. e., after Spencer; why he describes the process as a teleological integrating movement toward conscious control, i. e., adding purpose to Spencer's equilibrium; why he considers First Principles as results of previous inductions transmitted to us, i. e., after Spencer, and why he explains the thought-process as an adaptation not of structure to function as with Spencer, but of function to Reality, which is conceived as the product and result of the thought functioning. Reality therefore is considered as ever in the making, and here Pragmatism places its doctrine of Free-will, which, with Professor James, means the introduction of "changes" into the world. In criticism we say that, although Pragmatists teach the identification of thought and will by explaining thought as Purposive Action, yet in fact they admit the distinction by regarding some thought as not here and now entering into the purposive action. Thus Professor James writes: "The practical value of true ideas is primarily derived from the practical importance of their objects to us. These objects are, indeed, not important at all times, and these ideas, however verifiable, will be practically irrelevant and had better remain latent. Yet since almost any object may some day become temporarily important, the advantage of having a general stock of *extra* truths, of ideas that shall be true of merely possible situations, is obvious."[2] Professor Dewey writes that "the conflict in thought makes certain elements in experience assume conscious objectification;" "that the most characteristic trait of consciousness is its selective function with reference to stimuli;" that "the subjective is the holding of contents from definitely asserted position;" that "the objective is that which is carried forward in the process, the subjective is what is left behind" or "excluded from the problem;" that "this subjective may become the initial in other problems and remains a fact, even a worthful fact, as a part of one's *inner* experience." He admits "abstractions which are without possible reference or hearing" on the specific problem, says "thought starts from a *specific*, i. e., particular occasion and ends at a specific issue," and holds that "in the history of scientific inquiry there is a relegation of accepted meanings into the limbo of mere ideas."[3] These words show clearly that there are conscious elements in experience which

[2] "Pragmatism," p. 203.

[3] l. c., Ch. X.

here and now do not enter into the present purposive thought-process. This means that while all purpose includes the element of thought, yet all thought-elements are not purposive here and now, although they may become so. But this is the fundamental teaching of Scholastic Philosophy, and Professor Dewey's admission of this truth destroys the basic element of his system. In fact, the introduction of purpose as the guiding element in the thought-process apparently makes thought purposive, and in truth much thought is purposive, but closer analysis shows that purpose is selective both in the beginning and throughout the thought-process, and selection means that certain conscious elements of experience are excluded from the present process. They are latent or quiescent and exist in the mind, for Professor Dewey describes them. Therefore all conscious experience is not at the same time purposive action.

In explaining the technique of thought, Pragmatists appeal to the "working hypothesis" of Physical Science. To them knowledge is confined to judgment and not to judgment pure and simple, but to a special kind of judgment, viz., the judgment whose meaning is uncertain. Hence knowledge begins with *doubt* and is in essence an *inquiry*. The subject of the judgment is the *mental fact,* the predicate is the *idea*. The process is the determination of the *fact,* and the *idea* accomplishes this after the manner of a working-hypothesis. In criticisism we may say that knowledge, according to the expressed statements of Pragmatists, is not confined to the judgment, for they admit conscious elements in experience which are not included in the judgment process going on here and now. Therefore the technique of the working-hypothesis cannot be applied to *all* our conscious states, but is confined to the actual judgment-process of the moment. Furthermore, the working-hypothesis cannot be applied in explanation of all judgment, for there are judgments whose truth is grasped without any process of inquiry, e. g., first principles and axioms. These are the basis of knowledge. To deliberately exclude self-evident truths from being considered knowledge and to confine knowledge to elucidation of mental situations which are doubtful is to make Skepticism the beginning and basis of knowledge. Finally, even in the process of the doubt-judgment, the idea is not a working-hypothesis. If it were, then the only difference in ideas would be their efficiency in solving the situation. But the presence of purpose in the process shows clearly that some ideas are selected in preference to others as more fitted to meet the situation, and that they are selected because their difference in character is perceived antecedent to their work.

IV. CRITICISM.

The postulates in the background of Pragmatism are fragments

coming from the broken Science-Philosophy of the last century. They are not true in themselves, and no mere combination can ever make them true. The sole characteristic Doctrine of Pragmatism, which forms them into the new combination, is not true; for Pragmatists admit that all conscious elements of experience are not purposive. This means that all thought is not purposive.

To take the Associative Psychology of Spencer, Mill and Bain, discarded for some years in the schools, and to turn it, by the twist of a word, into a new system, does not make a new system in reality, but in appearance only. The fundamental difficulties unanswerable to the Old Psychology are thus carried over into the New and persistently cry out for a solution. To get the old structural mechanism to work by the use of a word will not solve the difficulties. The mechanism itself needs attention.

Thus how can Pragmatism explain *unity of consciousness, memory, anticipation, personal identity* or even *reflection?* In fact, Pragmatists give minute description of the mental process in all its stages and mention the other elements of conscious experience which are *outside* the process; but forget to explain the most important problem of mental life, viz., who *sees* all this. Pragmatists explicitly reject a *soul* or *mind,* but in their descriptions of mental life actually postulate its existence.

There is *direct* knowledge, e. g., when I deal with external things, as well as *reflex* knowledge, e. g., meditation. To confound both or to neglect the former and make the logic of reflective thought constitute the logical theory is on a par with confirming the use of the term knowledge to the judgment of doubt and assume that this kind of knowledge is all we have.

Mental distinction does not mean actual separation. I can distinguish many elements in combination without thereby separating them.

In calling attention to the activity of mental life, Pragmatism insists upon a truth. Mental life is active. Its explanation of this activity, however, is false. This is the purpose of the present article, viz., to point out that the distinctive doctrine of the latest philosophical system is based upon the false definition of the idea: the most fundamental and apparently the simplest element in mental life.

John T. Driscoll.

Fonda, New York.

IS IT EVER LAWFUL TO TELL A LIE?—AN INQUIRY.

IN this essay I propose to discuss the question of the morality of lying and to investigate our notions of truthfulness and falsehood. I wish to probe the principle which condemns a lie as wrong and approves of veracity as right, in order that we may more clearly understand the nature and extent of the obligation we are under to speak the truth and lie not. I have been led to the examination of this subject by some awkward instances of allowable deception which I find very hard to justify on the ordinary recognized principles of moral science. For example, within the domain of rubrics a question arises whether it is lawful for a priest to celebrate Mass without a Missal? The answer to this question is in the affirmative, provided two conditions are complied with, namely, he must be certain that he has the Mass by heart and he must place some other book on the Missal-stand, lest the faithful present be scandalized. But the question at once arises how this second condition is justifiable, since it misleads the faithful unto believing that the priest is reading from the book when he is not, as a matter of fact? Another and similar case occurs in regard to the confessional. It is prescribed that when a confessor hears confessions in the presence of others, and if for some reason he has to defer absolution from a penitent, he must, to save the character of the penitent, say some form of prayers over him. Now, is not the simulation of absolution an inevitable deception of those around? And then there is the historical example of St. Athanasius, so often quoted as an instance of pardonable equivocation, who by an ambiguous statement misled and escaped his pursuers. These cases, and many others of a like nature, which may be cited brings us face to face with a serious problem, which is this: On what grounds are we to justify an action or words which have for direct object the deception of others, even though this deception may be the means of effecting greater good?

Various solutions of a more or less plausible character are offered to this question, but not all, if any of them, are free from grave difficulties which make one feel dissatisfied as regards their validity. At first sight one may be inclined to justify the cases of deception cited on the well-known principle of a cause with two effects. Here is an act—the placing of the book or the recital of some prayers—with two effects, one bad and the other good, whose morality we seek to determine. The good effect is the prevention of scandal or defamation, while the bad is the deception of innocent onlookers. There can be no doubt but the good counterbalances the evil effect,

but is the other condition necessary for the justification of the principle present? I do not think so. For it is plain that the good results from the evil effect and is produced through its medium. You have in these instances a deordination or insubordination of essences which nature did not intend. It was never destined by Providence that the deception of one man should lead to another's benefit, nor even to that of his own, whereas here we have the deception made the immediate and necessary means of the good results produced. For unless those present were deceived, the scandal and defamation feared could by no means be obviated. Accordingly, we are forced to abandon this solution to the problem and seek for one in another direction.

Now the moral principle which we desiderate must be of such a nature as not only to lay down a general rule as to the obligation of truthfulness, but, further, it must, without being violated itself, make allowance for such apparent, if not real, exceptions as men almost universally recognize as lawful. For, after all, what is the duty of a moralist more than to give scientific shape to conclusions arrived at by the general concensus of mankind? The race comes first, and by its intuitions, or by the test of sweet over bitter experience, labels some acts as good and others bad. Then comes the ethician who ingeniously arranges these acts according to uniform and universal categories or principles which underlie the various classes of acts, and which are as immutable as the natures themselves from which the acts proceed and about which they are concerned. It is exactly similar to what occurs in physical science where the phenomena are first observed and noted, after which the scientist classifies them and discovers their underlying principle. Having regard, then, to the phenomena, as it were, of lying and deception which society has noted, and concerning which it has issued its prohibition or permission, as the case may be, will not the principle which I shall presently enunciate be taken into account and satisfy all the circumstances, for while it determines the rule it leaves room for the allowable exceptions?

In a lie we must recognize a twofold malice carefully to be distinguished. First, there is the malice of not conforming our words to the truth; that is, to the ideas existing in our mind; while the second malice consists in deceiving another. To these two malices correspond two correlative duties on the part of the speaker—he must not say what he believes to be untrue and he must not deceive another. The former of these duties admits of no exception: our words must ever truly express our thoughts, for by nature they are destined for no other purpose than to externate the concepts of the speaker and to use them to belie these concepts and to convey what

the speaker believes to be untrue is to pervert the immutable order of nature and to be guilty of a moral deordination. The second duty, however, does not impose so stringent and inexorable an obligation. Its extent is only commensurate with the right on the part of the hearer to be told the truth, or at all events not to be deceived by a lie. When he exceeds or has lost his right to be truly informed, the speaker has no duty towards him, but he still remains under the obligation to himself or to the Author of nature, who ordained words to be the impression of one's thoughts, and not their concealment. On this principle it is quite easy to justify such evasions, equivocations and other forms of deception as are regarded by men generally to be lawful in certain circumstances or when there is present what they term a just cause. This cause I consider present as often as the hearer has no right to be told the truth and may be deceived for his own benefit or for the benefit of another whose right he is invading by an impertinent question or by unjust prosecution. This principle, then, furnishes an easy answer to the questions raised at the outset. The laying of a book other than the Missal on the stand and the recital of prayers different from those of absolution over a penitent are actions which are certainly not lies in themselves, whereas also they are not wrong nor forbidden because of the deception they effect, because the persons misled have no right to be informed of the true condition of affairs—what concern of theirs is it whether there is a real Missal on the altar and if the penitent is actually absolved? And the scandal or defamation averted outweighs the evil consequence of deception. Similarly, when St. Athanasius, in answer to the inquiry of his pursuers, if he had seen Athanasius, replied, "Yes, pass on; he is not far from you," he stated but what was objectively true; his words were a suitable expression of the truth, yet they were calculated to mislead; but such deception was quite justifiable on the ground that his cruel persecutors had forfeited all claim to exact information. In this way we can defend all other cases of equivocation and mental reservation which are recognized as permissible.

The principle enunciated and expanded in the foregoing paragraph is, I believe, that on which theologians rely for their defense of deviations from the strict rule of truthfulness which are regarded as allowable. To the same the present writer adhered hitherto with implicit confidence. But on a further and fuller investigation of the whole question of veracity, lying and deception, my convictions have been shaken, and this principle I have come to regard as unsatisfactory in many respects and inapplicable to many cases which can be adduced. Hence, as a result of a more exhaustive study of the subject, I have been forced to modify my views, and the fruit of

my labors I set forth in the subsequent pages. I must honestly confess that I am not quite satisfied with the conclusions reached, but I have been urged to them by the considerations brought forward. If I were to follow my own inclinations and to be influenced by my previous prejudices, I should willingly take my stand on the principle already explained; but in matters of this kind we are not free to determine our own rules and draw our own conclusions, but we must try to arrive at what is objectively true, and to that end be docilely guided by the evidence at our disposal. Only in this way can the true interests of any science be promoted.

Now, in the first place, I think we may safely define a lie as "saying what one knows to be false with intent to deceive." With this definition I feel confident all parties can agree. At least it contains as much as anybody requires for the essence of lying; whether it contains more or not will be clear from what is afterward said. If, however, instead of confining ourselves to the words of any definition, we go and investigate the objective reality and try to discover wherein precisely consists the malice of lying and where arises the obligation of avoiding it, we at once find ourselves up against two schools of thought, which, though in practice they may be in thorough agreement, in theory they are widely divergent. The intuitional school of ethics places the essence of a lie in the want of conformity of words with the concepts in the mind. They regard a lie sufficiently defined by the words *locutio contra mentem,* and hence the obligation imposed on us by the virtue of truth is to conform our words to our ideas, and while we know one thing to be true, not to utter with our lips quite the opposite. St. Thomas puts it briefly thus: "Of its nature a lie is evil, since it is an act which falls on inordinate matter. For inasmuch as words are by nature signs of concepts, it is unnatural and inordinate for one to signify with his voice what he has not in his mind." Accordingly, it is plain that intuitional ethics places the peculiar malice of a lie in the disorder which consists in the difformity of words from the concepts in the mind, and that regardless of the consequences. Were a lie instrumental in procuring the greatest amount of good, nay, even could it save the universe from destruction, still on this theory it would not be lawful to tell the least lie; it is an act so essentially immoral and bad in itself. But the direct and natural effect of a lie, which is its deception of another, this St. Thomas considers as appertaining only to the perfection of a lie, and is by no means of its essence.

On the other hand, Utilitarianism, whose uniform practice it is to judge of the tree by its fruits, condemns lying because of its baneful consequences. This system holds the essential malice of a lie to

consist in its deception and in its destruction of that confidence so necessary for social life. In fact, it is so enormous an evil that if universally practiced it would destroy the very foundation on which society rests and render its continuance impossible. For is not language the sole medium of intercourse? It is the cement of the social edifice wherein men are united and unified in a common mode of existence, where each derives the greatest advantages from the assistance of his fellow. But once speech becomes corrupted and perverted by lying, so that no man can believe or rely on the assurances and assertions of his neighbor, then no longer is this common life endurable and society is at an end. For language, then, is not only useless, but worse than useless, since it defeats its own object, in which case better live apart and seek what happiness one may than enter society, where you are ever exposed to be deceived and defrauded. I may here quote the words of John Stuart Mill, the ablest champion of Utilitarianism in modern times, in regard to this matter:

"It would often be expedient [he says] for the purpose of getting over some momentary embarrassment or attaining some object immediately useful to ourselves or others to tell a lie. But inasmuch as the cultivation in ourselves of a sensitive feeling on the subject of veracity is one of the most useful and the enfeeblement of that feeling one of the most hurtful things to which our conduct can be instrumental, and inasmuch as any even unintentional deviation from truth does that much towards weakening the trustworthiness of human assertion, which is not only the principal support of all present social well-being, but the insufficiency of which does more than anything that can be named to keep back civilization, virtue, everything on which human happiness in the largest scale depends, we feel that the violation for a present advantage of a rule of such transcendent expediency is not expedient, and that he who, for the sake of a pr sent advantage to himself or to some other individual, does what depends on him to deprive mankind of the good and inflict upon them the evil involved in the greater or less reliance they can place on each other's words, acts the part of one of their worst enemies."

If such are the evil effects of lying, is it possible to exaggerate the paramount importance of veracity and overestimate the stringency with which the obligation of being truthful should be urged by society and by the laws of nature on which society is built?

Now, were I asked to determine offhand which of these two systems better explains the source and obligation of the virtue of truthfulness, I should be very slow to make my choice. But although I should not care at once to decide, still, while pondering on the question, some considerations have occurred to me which I think well to

bring forward and which I believe will help us to discriminate them and declare our preference for the one or the other. My intention is to bring forward some cases which are admitted on all sides and about the morality of which there is no quarrel, and by means of these we can test the principles of the opposing camps, and then whichever principle most consistently explains all cases is the one of our choice. For a principle to be of any value must be consistent and such throughout, and should there be any concrete cases within its scope with which it cannot deal, it is considered to fail and must be rejected. This is true of principles in physical science—one fact may overturn a long-venerated law—equally true is it in moral science.

Intuitional ethicians, while reprobating all lies and admitting no possible excuse for lying, nevertheless allow mental restrictions and equivocations when there exists a sufficient cause. By equivocation we understand the use of an expression capable of two meanings, one true, the other false, for the purpose of suggesting the false meaning to the hearer without committing the speaker to that meaning. Thus they allow you to deceive another on certain occasions, provided, however, you do so by an expression capable of a true interpretation. You are free even not merely to permit, but to intend this deception. For unless the deception is intended, why equivocate at all? But while they will allow you to mislead in this way, they will not tolerate deceit by a downright lie, as the inviolability of truth must be preserved, say they. The conformity of words to concepts is an unalterable duty which brooks no exception. I must confess I am not at all satisfied with this subtle distinction. It seems but a mere formalism, having little or nothing to recommend it beyond its general acceptance for many ages. For, if free to deceive, why such delicacy in the selection of a set form of words? It appears little more than a vain attempt to stand by the letter while deserting the spirit of veracity. This becomes evident if for a moment we consider what is ordinarily understood by speaking truthfully. Is it not plain that the function of veracity is not so much to measure our concepts by precise words as to endeavor to express our mind in such terms as will produce an impression on our hearer corresponding to what we possess in ourselves?

Truth, like language, has to do with the particular individual addressed, and it is of no importance what sense our words may convey to outsiders, provided they beget in the mind of him we speak to such information as we possess and to which we give utterance and expression. In the words of Professor Sidgwick, "The duty of truth-speaking is not to utter words which *might*, according to common usage, produce in other minds beliefs corresponding to

our own, but words which we believe will have this effect on the persons whom we address." Hence the only reason I see for conforming our words to our concepts is that this is the surest means of communicating our ideas to those whom we address. But if departure from this conformity could better convey the true impression, I see no reason against so doing. In fact, I can conceive a set of circumstances wherein the truth can best be conveyed to some individual by words the very opposite of those which people generally would consider the true expression of the concepts in the mind of the speaker, and yet I am sure few would condemn the speaker in this case as guilty of a lie, though you may say he has broken away completely from the conformity of words and concepts. From this it is quite clear how futile is the attempt to safeguard equivocation from the common name of lie. At all events, it is impossible to label equivocation as a truth, for by other definitions they are diametrically opposed. He speaks the truth who expresses his mind in such words as are calculated and intended to produce a true impression on the mind of the hearer, regardless of how the words affect all others; whereas, he equivocates who expresses himself in such words as are calculated to convey a true sense to men generally, regardless of their effect on the person addressed, or rather even with the purpose of deceiving him. From which it is manifest how immaterial the difference between an equivocation and a lie; they are distinguished merely by subtle quibbling of no objective value. Hence if you allow equivocation, rather say a lie is lawful on certain occasions. *Pecca fortiter.* If you deceive at all, you need not be too nice in the choice of your form of words. An equivocation as efficaciously deceives as a lie, and the deception is equally intended in both cases. And as veracity has to do with the relations between speaker and hearer, and not between the speaker and his own words, both a lie and an equivocation are equally untrue, both equally fail in discharging the function of truth-speaking; that is, the duty of not deceiving another or of communicating to another through the medium of speech a true impression of the mind of the speaker.

From the foregoing it is fairly clear that I recognize no such independent and immutable obligation as that of conforming our words to our mental concepts. If there is a duty of conforming our words to our concepts, it exists because of the relation of these words to the impression produced on the hearer and solely because the words are a means to the objective result. The malice of a lie, in my opinion, is not any want of conformity which nature demands between words and concepts (for I do not believe there is any necessity or obligation urging us to this, independently of its injurious

effect), but consists in its deceit. The essence of a lie is in its deception—in the harm it inflicts on another who has a right not to be deceived, and on society by diminishing that mutual trust and confiding intercourse so essential to the welfare and happiness of mankind. This contention I hope to strengthen and make good by the following considerations:

Why is it that I can tell as many incredible falsehoods as I please, which I am aware none will believe, and nobody will regard me on that account as a liar? For example, I can tell a man I was up in the moon, or that the wall which he sees to be white is black, or that two and two are five, and still be considered quite innocent of a lie. In like manner I can speak as many falsehoods as I wish to children and madmen without fear of being accused of lying. Further, I can utter all the untruths imaginable in the absence of any listener, or in a tongue unknown to the hearers and for this I do not suppose anybody would impugn me for want of veracity. Besides, society recognizes as lawful the use of such expressions as "not guilty" before a court of law, or "not at home" to an unwelcome visitor, or "I don't know" to an impertinent questioner, though in each case these may convey a sense the very opposite of what is true, and, as far as is in the power of the speaker, produce a false impression in the mind of the hearer, else why use them at all? What do all these examples prove? Well, if they prove one thing beyond another, it is this—that there is no distinct and separate obligation of giving expression to our concepts by true and corresponding words. There is no deordination in saying what we know to be false, provided there is no danger of the deception of individuals or of injury accruing to society therefrom. For if such natural duty exists, as intuitionalists claim, of conforming our words to the ideas existing in our minds, it would bind *semper et pro semper;* it would admit of no exception. But if exceptions do exist, and are generally recognized even by their own school—well, we are not to quarrel with them, but with the principle with which they are inconsistent. Such we see to be the case. The examples I have cited deviate from that immutable and universal conformity between concepts and their expression which the law of nature demands in the opinion of intuitional moralists. Hence we feel induced to abandon this school and seek elsewhere for the source of the obligation of veracity, and thereby strive to establish some consistent principle which, while it condemns lying generally as bad and wrong, nevertheless makes allowance for such exceptions as we have already adduced and more of a similar character.

From what has been hitherto said it is plain that I put the essence of a lie in its deceit and the detriment thereby resulting to the indi-

vidual and to society. Accordingly, the source of our obligation to speak the truth is rights of the individual and of society, which we must not infringe by any form or fraud or deception. Language, which is the vehicle of truth, has to do between man and man—is a social asset destined by God for the benefit of society. Veracity, whose purpose does not exceed that of language, has the same object. Its utility is to communicate the thoughts and sentiments of a man to his fellows and so beget mutual confidence and aid social progress, whereas, lying defeats this object; it retards and tends to destroy the well-being of society, and thereby lessens the happiness of ourselves and others whose welfare it is our interest and duty to promote. Thus far I feel drawn towards the Utilitarian principle. For I recognize that the alternative is between Intuitionalism and no exception, or Utilitarianism and some exceptions. But there can be no doubting the fact that exceptions to the rule of truth do exist, however subtly one may try to explain them away and label them with any other name than a lie—lawful, I admit, but still a lie according to the definition and true sense of the word.

But on what grounds does Utilitarianism admit exceptions, and how reconcile them with its principle? On no other basis than that of public utility are they allowed. Men recognize that in certain difficult circumstances to expect the truth would be to demand too much; it would redound to the public injury, and as a consequence deception is allowed in all such cases. Men cannot get along apart; they must enter society, and so to promote the interest of society is to promote their own well-being. Hence they must cherish all the social virtues, of which the chief is veracity. Accordingly, as far as truth-speaking helps on society, men are bound to it. But the rule of truth is not so rigorous that it will not admit of exceptions—and these are such cases wherein the breach rather than the observance of truth is of greater benefit to society and to the human race. Hence we see it is the one principle regulates the rule and the exceptions—social utility. What are these exceptions *in. individuo* it is not for each one to decide, but it must be left to the experience of the race to determine. It has done so in several cases. For example, the culprit who is accused before a court of justice is not bound to confess his guilt; he is even free to deny it, because his words will not deceive his hearers, and it would be too hard to expect a man to incriminate himself. The servant can say her mistress is not at home, because to have to speak the truth would be either to have to admit every undesirable visitor or to turn them away unceremoniously, both of which courses would lead to very unpleasant issues. Hence society has adopted the happier plan. Similarly, if we had to unbosom ourselves to every impertinent ques-

tioner, life would be intolerable, and that secrecy which plays so important a part in the business of life would be at an end; accordingly, we can deceive such an inquirer, who has no right to be properly informed. These and many other cases which could be adduced are all guided by the one common principle of Utilitarianism, which in this matter of veracity, as in all others, has laid down one common standard by which to test the moral worth of all acts —determining that act to be right which if universally practiced results in the aggregate in the greatest happiness of the race; whereas, that act is wrong which, no matter how beneficial in a particular case, would if generally allowed cause the scale of misery to fall.

The foregoing must seem an extreme view to those of us who from the days when we first read our penny Catechism have looked upon all lies as essentially bad and inexcusable for any motive, however good, and I must confess that I for one had to do some violence to myself to draw myself away from the traditional view and adopt the above conclusions. But as I said before, I do so, however reluctantly, because of the reasons given. As to the validity and strength of these, I leave it to others to decide. They weighed with me and led me on to the conclusions I have drawn. Others might see their way to differ from them. If so, I shall not complain nor quarrel with them. All I seek is light, and in fewer questions is it more difficult to find than in this perplexed one as to whether it is ever lawful to tell a lie.

Cornelius F. Cremin, S. T. L.

St. Paul Seminary.

LOUVAIN.*

Salvate, Athenae nostrae, Athenae Belgicae,
O fides sedes artium et fructu bona,
Lateque spargens lumen nomen tuum!
—Justus Lipsius, 1547-1606.

ATHENS of Belgium—no prouder name could be given to the venerable University of Louvain! Echoes as they are from days now long gone by, these beautiful Latin lines are a tribute to Louvain from the great soul of one of the most illustrious scholars of the time—Justus Lipsius, a loyal son of our holy Mother the Church and the constant admirer of the old alma-mater, where he was a professor. During the last quarter of the sixteenth century, when he taught at Louvain, the influence of

*The writer thanks the editor of the *American College Bulletin*, of Louvain, for permission to make use of a former article in writing this.

Lipsius upon letters and upon art spread far beyond the borders of the Low Countries, and the Universities of Rome, Paris and Cologne strove with one another to secure his services for their faculties of law. But the "Urbs amati nobis," as he lovingly calls Louvain, ever held the first place in his affections. The lustre his writings shed upon all fields of learning has never been dimmed in the centuries that have flown by since his death, and it was the realization of the glorious place he holds in the history of the University which made every Lovanist rejoice that the first official act of the festivities during Louvain's jubilee in 1909 was the unveiling of a statue in his honor in one of the principal squares of the city.

One cannot wander through this mediaeval university town without breathing again the spirit of the olden times. Little, very little, indeed, has changed since the happy days of the past, when the quaint crooked streets of Louvain were filled with merry throngs of students, who had been attracted in thousands to her halls by the eminence of her learning and the renown of her teachers. Four hundred years ago, when the University of Louvain was a dominating factor in the world's history, Flemish art, with its wondrous paintings from the hands of Rubens and Vandyck, and the commercial activity of Bruges—the Venice of the North—and of Antwerp had placed Flanders upon a plane of industrial and intellectual prosperity which probably has never since been equaled in Belgium or Holland. That the city of Louvain profited by this activity is evident from the fact that it numbered nearly two hundred thousand inhabitants, all busily toiling away for the markets of Antwerp and Bruges. Many volumes have been written during the past five centuries upon the prosperous days of this, the old capital of Brabant, as well as upon the life of its University, and the catalogue of these volumes would be a surprise to those who have never read the narrative of its fascinating and instructive history. The University has never lacked loyal sons who love to tell her life-story over and over again. From the days when John Molanus, who was rector magnificus in 1578, wrote his "Historia Lovaniensis" to the publication of the classic "Description" by Justus Lipsius, a half century later, and to the histories of Vandervelde, of Baron de Reiffenberg, of Van Even, and especially that of Monsignor de Ram, the illustrious first rector magnificus of the restored university (1834), a large collection of works have been edited and published, throwing much valuable light upon the important part played by the university in Reformation times and afterwards during the Spanish and Austrian domination of the Netherlands. The city of Louvain itself

might be described as a quaint Sleepy Hollow, filled to-day with the same picturesque customs which inspired the paintings of Rubens, Jan Steen and Van Ostade; and though the ordinary tourist—unless attracted by the exquisite Gothic beauty of its Hotel de Ville—passes Louvain by as uninteresting, it has never ceased to be recommended by physicians as the healthiest town of the Netherlands on account of its high position and the salubrity of its air. In fact, it used to be a *bon-mot* among the students of the university in pre-Reformation days that Pope Martin V., in drawing up the Pontifical Bull for the erection of the University (December, 1425), by happy collocation of words had *canonized* the temperate climate and the healthy condition of the city; for the Decree "Sapientia immarcescibilis" records the fact that the Pope sent messengers from Rome to see the city, and that it was found a most fitting place for a university, "on account of the mildness of its air and the abundance of those special things which are necessary for human use."

At the commencement of the fifteenth century no school for higher learning existed in the whole stretch of territory occupied at present by modern Belgium and Holland. Schools for the humanities had been established alongside the cathedral churches, in religious convents and in the houses of the Hieronymites or Brothers of the Common Life; but for advanced studies in philosophy, theology, law and medicine students from the Low Countries were obliged to go to Cologne, Erfurth and Paris. Cologne and Paris especially drew large contingents of Belgian and Dutch youths to their academic halls. But the expatriation of the future leaders of Belgium in countries which were often rent by civil disturbances and wars caused great inconvenience and threatened to check the intellectual progress of the Netherlands. The renewal of the war between England and France in 1433 and the desolate conditions of the French provinces under Charles VII in the years preceeding the heroic assistance of Blessed Joan of Arc, made access to Paris impossible to the Belgians. The counsellors of the young Duke of Brabant, John IV., conceived the plan of erecting a university in Belgium itself, in order to accommodate the ever increasing number of students. In compliance with their worthy request, the Duke sent one William Neeffs, who had gained his doctorate at Cologne and who afterwards became the first rector magnificus of Louvain, as envoy to the Pope in the name of all those interested in the foundation of the new university. His mission was successful, and on April 26, 1426, after a journey which at the time took nearly two hundred days, Neeffs arrived in Louvain with the precious Bull of erection, dated December 9 of the

previous year. It is interesting to note in passing that this valuable document, which had been lost to sight for several centuries, was found in 1909, in the archives of the Seminary of Haarlem and was returned to the University of Louvain through the generosity of the Bishop of Bois-le-Duc.

The Halles built in 1317 by the drapers guild were placed at the disposal of the university, and on October 20, 1426, the courses were solemnly opened by Duke John IV., with four major faculties—art, medicine, civil law and canon law. Theology was not begun till 1431, when Pope Eugene IV. instituted the fifth faculty and made the university complete. The Halles, to which a second story was added in 1680, are substantially the same to-day as they were nearly five centuries ago, and in them were located, up to two years ago, the principal lecture halls of the university. From 1425 to 1500 the young university gradually increased the number of the subordinate faculties or schools, while its students and professors grew to a total of from six to eight thousand. Some of the earliest printing presses were set up around it, such as that of John of Westphalia, who first printed Juvenal and Cicero at Louvain in 1474, and that of Thierry Martens, the Aldus of the Low Countries, whose influence both as a printer and a scholar was paramount in Belgium at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It was then that a period of the highest prosperity commenced at the university.

The old chronicles of Louvain during the happy days when poverty was common among the students contain many amusing pages describing the daily life of the young men who frequented her halls. Despite the generosity of the townspeople, many a student, it is related, had to work hard outside of study hours to pay the pittance asked for his lodging and tuition. One of the chronicles relates that the future Pope Adrian VI. when attending the university found himself so poor that one time he could not buy candles to study with and was obliged to prepare his lessons sitting under the lamp which hung at the door of St. Peter's. The invention of printing robbed the young men of one means of income which the copying of valuable manuscripts had always afforded them. As a result we find professors who had gained a little fortune to support themselves in the autumn of their life, when their teaching days would be over, building homes for their pupils and housing them at a price which seems trifling in this money-loving age. As the years went by the faculties were enriched by the Popes and the princes of Brabant, and colleges were erected on all sides so rapidly that soon there were some forty university buildings scattered throughout the city. "When one

has seen Oxford and Cambridge," wrote Monsignor de Ram, "one can picture what Louvain must have been in these early days with its Halles and its forty-three colleges, the rich donations and the numerous burses, its civil exemptions and academic privileges and the life and movement of its six thousand students." Among those whose names are linked inseparably with the university in its golden age are Erasmus, who wrote, in the days of his friendship with Louvain, that the splendor of its learning and culture exceeded every other university in the world except Paris; Justus Lipsius, acknowledged in the intellectual circles as one of the most learned men of his time; Florentinus, who gained his degree in Louvain in 1491, and afterwards became Pope, under the name of Adrian VI. and the illustrious pupil of Adrian, the young Prince Charles of Spain, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, who made his studies at Louvain. He lived out beyond the boulevards, in an old castle, which has since fallen to ruin, on the site of the present Benedictine Monastery of Mont Cesar. A statue of Our Lady, over twenty feet high, now stands upon the spot, and the outstretched Hands of the Infant Jesus scatter perpetual blessings on the city of Louvain, which lies at His Mother's feet. The civic exemptions enjoyed by the students often brought them into conflict with the city authorities, and the university was forced to organize a sort of police corps of its own, which patroled the town at night and arrested the over-boisterous night prowlers. The old prison of the university, called the carcer or cage, was often the scene of pitched battles between the police and the friends of some unlucky student. Yet, in spite of all their youthful pranks, the Louvain students enjoyed a good name throughout Europe and the Chronicles contain many encomiums on their conduct from strangers who visited the university in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, and who avowed that nowhere were the young men more orderly than at Louvain, and that nowhere was the discipline more severe and better observed. And these were the days when students carried swords and wore leather jackets! The rise of the so-called Reformation in 1517 badly disturbed the peace of the university. It threw its professors into the unhappy confusion of the times, not alone on account of their noble defense of the faith against Luther (they were the first to expose his heresies), but also on account of the theological controversies which began shortly afterwards between Michael Baius and the saintly Jesuit, Lessius, and which continued down to the days of Jansenius, who was a professor in the faculty of theology. One can catch a glimpse of Luther's hatred for Louvain in his attacks upon the professors, especially in one very unpleasant letter which Bossuet has quoted

in his "Variations" in the original Latin, not daring, as he says, to translate it into French owing to its indecency.

After the passing of the acts of supremacy and Uniformity in England (1559), Louvain became the place of refuge for all the leading English, Irish and Scotch exiles, who sought in Belgium the freedom of conscience denied them at home. During Elizabeth's reign Louvain was crowded with the professors and students of Oxford and Cambridge. The English Catholic exiles began two colleges in the town, which they called *Oxford* and *Cambridge,* and where the students were housed until the foundation of the English College at Douay (1569). It was to Louvain that the fleeing remnants of the religious orders of England came, and it was there that William Cardinal Allen, the Moses of the English Catholic *diaspora,* continued his studies and received his doctorate. Louvain is also the cradle of the present English Jesuit province, and it was in its halls that the clergy of Ireland were educated up to the reign of James II. It was there also that the counter-Reformation found its strongest and bravest exemplars, and there that the English School of Apologetics, which gathered around the last two Bishops of the old English hierarchy, published that splendid series of volumes which did more to stem the tide of Protestantism in England than all the threats of Philip II. and the Armadas. Relics of the Irish and the English exiles abound in the city, and even up to the present time the English Dominicans possess two free burses founded by Cardinal Howard in the faculty of theology.

No one did more for the persecuted English and Irish Catholic exiles of the time than the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, under whose personal direction the influence of Louvain increased to such an extent that it may fairly be claimed to have possessed at this period of its history the most flourishing place among the universities of the world. The foundation, however, of similar institutions of learning at Leyden and at Douay drew a large number of youths away from the old alma mater, while the constant internecine wars and the different sieges of Louvain during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not favorable to progress and study. The agitation caused by the "Augustinus" of Jansenius, one of the professors of theology from 1617 to 1630, the spread of Gallican ideas and the new theories in the natural sciences promulgated by Descartes, who was then in Holland, are but a few of the disturbing elements which deprived the University of Louvain of much of its former splendor. The university, which formed a sort of free and independent republic in the Duchy of Brabant, was often called upon also to assist the inhabitants of Louvain in the attacks made upon the town by Dutch and German marauders.

One classic incident of this kind occurred at the close of the reign of Charles V., when the brutal Captain Van Rossem besieged the town, after having burned many of the villages in the surrounding country. All who have seen Louvain will remember that it is surrounded with three series of high boulevards, now covered with maple trees and flowers, but then lined with forts at regular intervals and manned with soldiers. At the time Van Rossem attacked the city the soldiers were absent in the south of Flanders, and Louvain was at the mercy of the invaders, whose motto: "L'incendie est le magnificat de la guerre," sufficiently indicates the enemies with whom the authorities had to deal. The Mayor soon realized that he could not expect much assistance from the frightened citizens, and he decided to appeal to the patriotism of the students. In the face of the peril which threatened them the rector magnificus and the Academic Senate allowed the young men to go out to meet the enemy. The courses were suspended and the student body, numbering nearly eight thousand, was divided into companies in the Vieux Marche, where they were captained by a rich Portuguese nobleman, Damien de Goes, who had made Louvain his home. When the siege began the students proved themselves heroes. For three days they fought with the enemy for the safety of the town. At all points the attacking party was repulsed, and on the evening of the third day Van Rossem retreated. Many of the students were wounded and ten were killed in the siege. Charles V. knighted the leaders of the student-army, and the university celebrated the victory by carrying the captured flags and banners in triumphial procession to the Dominican Church, where they are still preserved as relics of one of the noblest generations of young men Louvain has ever seen. The constant encroachment of the Austrian civil power upon the intellectual and the religious life of the university during the eighteenth century arrested the intellectual progress of former years; and, though we find among its professors such eminent scholars as Heuschling, Rega, Vanheyen and Minckelers, nevertheless the usurpation of the Church's sphere by the "royal sacristan," Joseph II was fatal to the advancement of the university and was but a prelude to its subsequent suppression. The gallant stand maintained by Cardinal Frankenberg, Archbishop of Malines, in 1789 against the innovations which the Austrian Emperor endeavored to introduce into the theological faculty and the noble efforts of Francis II., who undertook to reestablish the university on its ancient basis brought new life to Louvain for a time; but the unsettled condition of Belgium during the French Revolution practically ended all academic studies in its halls. In 1795 the

rector magnificus and the professors were ordered to attend in a body the opening of a Temple of Reason in the lovely Renaissance Church of St. Michael, where the sacrilege of Notre Dame was repeated. The response of the university was well worthy of its glorious past and was an echo of over three centuries of filial allegiance to the Mother Church: "We recognize no other legitimate or salutary worship except that which our Saviour, Jesus Christ, True God and True Man, has deigned to reveal to us and which His Church,—the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church—recognizes; consequently, our conscience will never permit us to take part, either directly or indirectly, in the worship to be established." This noble reply caused the official suppression of the university, and on October 20, 1797, the doors were closed to the students. The professors were dispersed and forbidden to teach; the riches of the university were confiscated for civic purposes, and its forty-three colleges turned over to the infidel government then in power. The university fell, but it fell nobly, a martyr to the cause of religious freedom and a sacrifice to the legal pillage which the French Republic has more than once sanctioned in its relations with the Church. The theological hall—to-day the Salle des Promotions—was turned into a theatre; that of canon law into a cafe; the reading room of the library into a dance hall; and the beautiful Salle de pas perdus into a butcher-shop. In 1805, after the nightmare of the French Revolution, Napoleon sold most of the old colleges. This is the reason why the heart of every lover of this old alma mater grieves as he walks along the picturesque streets of the town and sees here and there colleges, with the names of their founders still chiseled in the marble of their quaint Gothic portals, turned into barracks for soldiers, who cannot realize the ancient sanctity of their homes, and into public buildings and asylums where the *va-et-vient* of daily modern life seems a sacrilege against these mute memorials of the proud academic days of a hallowed past.

After the fall of Napoleon in 1815 several of the professors attempted to reconstruct the old faculties, but they were unsuccessful until 1830, when Belgium gained her independence from Holland; and in 1834 a Papal Brief from Pope Gregory XVI. gave the old schools of Louvain their former privileges and honors. The new university took up its quarters in the places made famous by the great men of bygone splendor and renown—in the Halles, in the College of Pope Adrian VI. and in the College of the Holy Ghost, with Monsignor De Ram as first rector magnificus. "As heir to the ancient alma mater erected in 1426," Canon Cauchie writes, in the "Catholic University Bulletin," October, 1907, "heir

also of the liberty recovered in 1830, the Catholic University of Louvain cherishes the twofold principle so dear to the Belgium nation, faith and freedom. From its erection in 1834 this centre of high scientific culture has always striven with ardor and perseverance to accomplish its mission of promoting in every field the interests of the Church and of the Fatherland."

Seventy-five years have passed since the solemn opening of the university, and those who know the history of the scientific and critical work it has accomplished during that time realize the abundant share Louvain has had in the progress of the nineteenth century. The corps of professors has contained and still contains scholars who are respected and revered as much by the Church as those outside her fold—Carnoy, Van Beneden, Van Gehuchten, scientists of international fame; John Mocller, the historian and protege of Neibuhr; De Harlay and Beelen, the celebrated orientalists; Canon David, the father of modern Flemish literature; Lamy, the exegetist; Abbeloos, Forget, Ladeuze, Van Hoonacker and Monsignor Hebbelynck, one of the foremost Egyptologists of the present day. Under the enthusiastic direction of these scholars Louvain has become a recognized centre for Oriental studies. Its historical seminary, founded by Jungmann, in 1889, and now under the able management of Alfred Canon Cauchie, has won the merited praise of De Rossi, of Godefroid Kurth and of Gabriel Monod. Its school of higher philosophy, begun by Cardinal Mercier in 1891, has gained the recognition of the universities of Germany, who send representatives yearly to the public defense of its thesis, and the theological course of the university, which demands from six to eight years of arduous study, after the completion of the ordinary seminary curriculum, enjoys probably the highest place of any in the world. The students, it has been said, take the long way round to reach their sheepskins, and the consequence is that where one finds in Belgium a professional man from Louvain, one finds an individual of a very superior education. The doctorate of theology is the most prized of all the degrees of the university; for out of the thousands of students who have been in attendance at the theological lectures during the past eighty years, only sixty have gained the title.

Another phase of the university which presents, perhaps, even a more interesting aspect is the history of the different colleges which have formed the strength of Louvain. The college where Vesalius, who founded the science of anatomy, was a teacher is but a stone's throw from the college erected by Pope Adrian VI., now the scene of the annual gathering of the professors and students; the College of Drieux, founded in 1559, which later became the

Academy of Fine Arts, and as such numbered among its former directors Constantine Meunier, whose work has lately attracted so much attention in art circles; the College of Diva, founded in 1576, now the house of the Picpus Fathers, wherein the young Joseph de Veuster acquired that spirit of self-sacrifice which was afterwards to send him to the leper settlement of Molokai, disguised under the immortal name of Father Damien; the three Irish colleges, which became the refuge of the Irish exiles in penal days, and from which came such scholars as Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, Thomas Stapleton, who was elected rector magnificus of Louvain no less than ten times, and Richard Creagh, who later became Primate of Ireland, and the old College d'Aulne, now the American College, which as such presents more interest than any other to the American reader. The rapid and almost marvelous progress which this latter institution was able to show on the occasion of its golden jubilee in 1907 was a joyous surprise to many of the old alumni who had returned to Europe for the first time since their ordination. Its enviable place as the "schola minor" of the university gives it the whole benefit of the keen intellectual activity of Louvain, without depriving it of that spirit of retreat so necessary for the perfect moulding of the young Levites of Christ. Its staff of professors is chosen from among the best in the university and the studies are directed under the guidance of its venerable rector, Monsignor De Becker. On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary in 1907 an old alumnus, the Very Rev. J. Van Der Heyden, who is now a resident in Louvain, after having lived twenty-five years in the missions of Idaho, published a history of the American College, in which we find the names of four Archbishops, sixteen Bishops and over eight hundred priests who were educated at Louvain for the Church in America.

Such in a few words, incomplete in themselves and giving merely an outline of the history of the pride of the Catholic Belgium, is the story of Louvain's great university. "You will ask me perhaps," said Monsignor Cartuyvels in one of his eloquent addresses, "how it was possible to erect without any resources and without any help from the government a university which counts its professors by the hundreds and its students by the thousands. The establishments which still continue to grow up around the university, could they have been built with beautiful words? No. The secret of the university's resources is solely the faith of the Belgian people. It is a faith of an entire nation which makes the Catholic University of Louvain a success, and this faith comes as strongly from the lowliest of her people as from the noble hearts of the Belgian Bishops, who have never failed in their duty towards their alma

mater. Louvain belongs to us, it belongs to our holy religion, and it is the place where our sons will keep their faith intact and their morals pure. Let the poor give their mite, let the rich give their gold, and God will do the rest."

The spirit of the students cannot be better described than by an incident which occurred during the last Liberal Government. At the foot of the rue de la Station, standing in the centre of a grass-plot facing the station, is a statue of Sylvan Van de Weyer, an anti-Catholic political leader, whom a former Liberal city administration undertook to make a great man by putting a statue up in his honor. The Catholic citizens were chagrined and disgusted and they chafed under the insult offered them. However, they had their revenge, and they have the students to thank for it. On the night of the 19th of February, 1879, a band of students armed with ladders and paint-pots climbed up to the statue and painted it a ridiculous combination of colors. They stole away again silently, leaving a paint-pot in the heroic hand of the Liberal leader. There was written at the time an account of the affair in Latin, parodying the well-known passage from the second book of Virgil's "Aeneid." The caricatures accompanying this celebrated burlesque were reprinted in some of the Belgian newspapers during the university jubilee of 1909, and they added no little gaiety to the happiness of the students. One must read the Latin to appreciate the rare wit which prompted it. Every line from beginning to end is alive with laughter. The reader of to-day can well imagine the fun the students enjoyed in conning over such lines as these: "Est in conspectu stationis notissima fama statua Van de Weyeri, illustrissimi hominis qui pulcherrimas dedit esperancias usque as diem quo decessit," and in reading the exclamation of the policeman, who cries out when he sees the statue the following morning: "Ecce nunc unam affariam! statua Van Weyeri depicta est omnibus coloribus; Studentes certe fecerunt! Quanta affaira! Decampat pandourus" (the policeman) "tam celeriter ut tombat super derrierum suum; qui cum esset largissimus et rebonditus, non sibi fecit malum!"

To one reared within the shadow of a modern university and familiar with its up-to-date buildings and spacious grounds the University of Louvain is at first sight disappointing. Many an American sent over to Louvain for theological studies is at a loss where to turn when the tram-car lands him at the back of St. Peter's Church and for a moment he stands bewildered, not knowing which way to go. On his left is the beautiful Hotel de Ville, and his first impulse is to mount its worn and weather-beaten stone-steps to ask if this might be the university, but the sight of

a stern-looking policeman turns him away, and he stops the first person he meets, asking in impossible French for the American College. He is directed to a little street at the side of the Hotel de Ville—the historic rue de Namur, and plodding up its rather steep hill, he soon sees the university loom up before him, just in the moment he has ceased to look for it. Disappointment—not to call it by a stronger word—is his first sentiment. Can this rough and ancient square-looking building be the celebrated University of Louvain, which was founded before Columbus was born? He enters the massive Gothic doorway of this old home of the drapers' guild, erected in 1317, to find himself in a large hall with Gothic pillars, cold as a tomb and filled with continual twilight. There is nothing inviting about this building, and with a sigh of discontent he goes out and is directed to his future home up the street—the American College. On his way up he passes college after college, and they all have the same ancient sleepy look about them as the building known as the Halles, a look as if they belonged to another day and another people. He expected to find a counterpart of an American university, with wide flowing campuses, a mother-house surrounded with colleges, dormitories and professors' homes, with shady lanes and pretty parks; and, instead, he sees the colleges separated from the Halles by rows of decrepit-looking houses, and his final thought is: Can this place be a success? Can it turn out doctors, lawyers, engineers and priests? It is the old story of appearances deceiving, for the same American learns within a short time that he is living in the midst of an intellectual and religious activity far superior and far more profound than anything America can boast of. He comes in contact with professors whose methods and whose learning inspire him with confidence and with enthusiasm, and thus when some great feast, such as the jubilee of 1909, comes round, he sees without any surprise the homage which the noted universities of the world pay to the old alma mater in sending as delegates to the festivities men whose name and fame are world-wide and whose presence in Louvain is a witness to the international influence which the pride of the Belgians enjoys in the world of religion and science. And yet, after all, the absence of that intangible something which the Old World calls tradition and which he feels the lack of in all his judgments and comparisons between America and Europe, makes it difficult for him to realize, even while living in the current of Louvain's delightful surroundings, that nearly five centuries have passed since the commencement of the academic lectures in the old Halles. The university has enjoyed a glorious period of success during that time, and has nobly withstood many dangerous political and theological crises

with its ancient motto, "La Foi et la Science," still unblemished in the rapid flight of time.

PETER GUILDAY.

Washington, D. C.

THE REAL FATHER ARCHANGEL LESLIE.

WHEN, in 1644, about five years after his death, John Baptist Rinuccini, Prince-Archbishop of Fermo, published the life of the Scotch Capuchin, Father Archangel Leslie,[1] he little thought to what a series of romantic biographies it would give rise and that it would become the subject of a critical controversy in an English periodical in the twentieth century. Monsignor Rinuccini, so the original story ran, formed a close intimacy with Father Archangel when the latter was sojourning in the convent of Monte Giorgio, in the Diocese of Fermo, and learned from his own lips all the incidents of his life, which he verified by reference to the records of the order, letters from England and the oral evidence of Scotsmen resident in Italy, averring that he himself was acquainted with the scenes of the Capuchin's missionary labors in his native country, having traveled in Scotland.[2] The book made an immediate impression and was in such demand that about a dozen editions were issued at brief intervals from 1644 to 1673. Attractively written in that dulcet Italian which Byron somewhere calls "the language of birds," it found many readers who were drawn no less by its vivid and picturesque style than by the succession of dramatic incidents it narrated, around which it threw somewhat of the glamour of romance. If, as has been said, he allowed his fancy to play around those incidents, his flights of imagination were surpassed by subsequent biographers. It is proverbial that a story loses nothing in its carriage, and the story of the Scotch Capuchin is confirmatory of the aphorism. The grave had not long closed over the remains of the poor friar when he was already legendary. An accretion of legends, half truth, half fiction, gathered round the bald, bare facts of his life-history until it became so overlaid with

---

[1] Il Cappucino Scozzese. Fermo, 1644.

[2] He may have confounded Scotia Major, one of the ancient names of Ireland, with which he was familiar as Papal Nuncio at the epoch of the Kilkenny Confederation, with Scotia Minor or Caledonia. G. Aiazzi (Nunziatura in Irlanda di Mons. G. B. Rinuccini, Florence, 1844) pertinently observes that if he visited Ireland in 1649 as Apostolic Legate it is more than probable he did not set foot in Scotland. He had no mission to fulfill there. Besides, Cromwell's ferocious partisans would have given him anything but a friendly reception. If he allowed himself such a literary license, why should he not have taken that of representing himself as the accurate and confidential interviewer of Father Archangel?

them that the real Father Archangel gave place to an imaginary creation, the offspring of the fertile fancy of later biographers. Although Rinuccini's book was, to use the words of Dr. Frédégand Callaly,[3] *"dramatisé à grand renfort de coups de thèâtre,"* it was not near so histrionic as later lives. Spanish and Portuguese translators contented themselves with reproductions in their respective languages of the original biography without making any additions to it. It was only when it came under the hands of a French translator-editor that it underwent a transformation. The first to introduce amplifications and apocryphal incidents was Pére François Barrault, Procurator-General of the Fathers of Christian Doctrine,[4] who rightly called his book a *"histoire merveilleuse."* He threw the reins loosely to his imagination and it evolved a pious romance. Full of striking incidents and pathetic passages, it appealed to emotional readers, who read it with avidity. All it needed was a well constructed plot worked into it to change it into an historical novel. He set the fashion for later writers, who, as he had filled up gaps left in Rinuccini's narrative, supplemented his with similar emendations, until all the resources of literary craftmanship were exhausted. Successive biographies, modeled on this, appeared in Portuguese, German, Flemish, French, Italian and English; the most interesting portions were incorporated in the "Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini" by Father Rocco da Cesinale; it ran as a serial through two English publications, published at wide intervals —the "Universal Magazine" and the "Franciscan Annals;" and the finishing touches were put to it in 1882 by Pére Richard, of Ixelles, in a volume of the "Bibliothèque des Familles."[5] The last named writer, a Capuchin, believing in the authenticity of the life, affirmed that it was true in all its details, and that he only resolved to write it after making the most minute researches and drawn his information from sources the most worthy of credence.

The present writer, trusting in Pére Richard's veracity and in compliance with the wishes of a clerical friend, was induced, not without some latent misgiving, to embody the leading events of this strange story in an article contributed to this periodical.[6] A certain colonial Bishop was so attracted by it that he wrote to the writer suggesting that it might be reproduced in pamphlet form by the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. The prelate's wishes were conveyed to the reverend secretary, and while the proposal was *sub*

[3] Essai Critique sur la Vie du P. Archange Leslie. Paris, 1914.

[4] Le Capucin Escossois, Histoire merveilleuse et tres veritable arrivée de notre temps. Rouen, 1660.

[5] Le Comte Georges de Leslie, au une Mission dans la Grande Bretagne au premier Siècle de la Reforme. Lille, 1882.

[6] "A Scotch Apostle," Vol. XXXIII., pp. 29-57; January, 1908.

judice, Father Thurston, the well-known Jesuit, as one of the publication committee, became aware of it, and, looking the matter up, made it the subject of an article in *The Month* under the damaging title, "A Bogus Biography."[7] This led to an epistolary controversy in the *Tablet* and to the abandonment of the idea of republication. The writer of the article, which afforded the learned Jesuit a tempting opportunity of exercising his remarkable talent for destructive criticism, urged the advisability of the Capuchins searching the archives of their order to get at the actual facts of Father Archangel's missionary career—a view which he ventured to put before Father Anselm Kenneally (then one of the Capuchin Definitors, now Archbishop of Simla), who promised to use his influence in that direction on his return to Rome. It would seem that His Grace did so, for after the lapse of six years the Rev. Dr. Frédégand Callaly, assistant archivist, has given the result of his painstaking researches in an admirable critical essay on the life of Father Archangel Leslie, contributed to the *Etudes Franciscaines*[8] and reproduced in pamphlet form. As a frontispiece it has an engraved authentic portrait of the much written-up friar of the seventeenth century, the work of Gérard Audran, of Lyons, the most celebrated French engraver of the *grand siècle*, from a cliché by Pére Edouard, of Alençon, archivist-general of the order and a writer who has acquired distinction by his Franciscan studies. Steering a safe and prudent middle course between the Scylla of a too easy credulity and the Charybdis of a too sweeping skepticism, Father Frédégand, sifting facts from fancies, brings to light the real Father Archangel. Emerging from the cluster of legends which incautious writers put in circulation under the garb of history, the figure of the Capuchin, if it does not loom so large in the historical retrospect, is represented to us in its true proportions; as the writer affirms, what it loses in romantic lustre it gains in true greatness.

He reminds us that the authenticity of the narratives of Rinuccini and Barrault and their numerous translators was long since questioned and disputed. On December 29, 1653, Father W. Christie, S. J., rector of the Scotch College at Douai, who had personally known Father Archangel, condemned in severe terms Rinuccini's "Il Cappuccino Scozzese." In 1692 the author of "Laurus Lesleana," or history of the Leslie family, passed a rather unfavorable judgment upon the book. In 1869 the "Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen" treated it as a pure romance. T. G. Law in the "Scottish Review" (July, 1891) went further; he made the Capuchin responsible for the falsities and fantasies of his biog-

[7] "The Month," Vol. CXII., p. 154, et seq.

[8] "Essai Critique sur la Vie du P. Archange Leslie." Paris, 1914.

raphers, describing him as an adroit and manifestly vain man, who attributed to his family a social position and the possession of a wealth which they never enjoyed, making himself the hero of romantic adventures which only existed in his own imagination. Father Thurston in his slashing criticism in *The Month* capped the climax of incredulity by applying to it the cant epithet "bogus." The learned Jesuit has since receded from that position, no longer tenable after Father Frédégand's exhaustive study of the subject. It is not "a pure romance," although a romantic element may have been unwarrantably introduced into it; nor is it altogether "a bogus biography." Underneath a fanciful superstructure of the dramatic or sensational there is a solid substratum of fact. Father Frédégand, who has approached the subject with an open and unbiased mind, has amply vindicated his Caledonian confrère from the aspersions of Mr. T. G. Law. In what he calls an essay in reconstructive biography he says the examination of ten autobiographical letters from Father Archangel to Cardinal Maffeo Barberini and information hitherto more or less unknown have enabled him to furnish certain data on the Capuchin's origin and his apostolate in Italy and Scotland.

He starts by stating that it is certain Father Archangel belonged to the Leslie family, one of the oldest in Scotland.[9] Of Hungarian origin, they came from the southeast of Europe in the eleventh century, and, having increased and multiplied, were very numerously represented in Scotland in the sixteenth century. With a humility befitting a Franciscan, he calls himself "a poor relation," a frank avowal, in complete disaccord with the "vanity" which Mr. Law imputes to him. Father Frédégand rejects the assumption of his early biographer that he was an offshoot of the more distinguished and titled branch of the Leslies,[10] but a distant relation of those Leslies who gave Bishops to the Church and generals and chancellors to the State. His father, James Leslie, was not a Count and he was not born at the manor of Monymusk, for the simple reason that it was never occupied by the Leslie family, but in Aberdeen or

[9] Between 1117 and 1199 Malcolm, son of Bartholf, obtained possession of Lesslyn or Leslie, a wild pastoral district of Aberdeenshire. His descendants took their surname from their lands.

[10] The family was first ennobled in 1457, when George Leslie of Rothes was made Earl of Rothes, or Lord Leslie. It seems that favoring fortune showered coronets upon them. There were Dukes of Rothes, Earls of Leven and Melville, Marquises of Ballinbreich, Lords Lindores, Lords Newark and Lords Balgony among them. Walter Leslie, a younger son of the house of Balquhain, who distinguished himself in the Austrian army in 1637, was created a Count of the Empire. A less enviable distinction attaches to the Rothes branch ofthis very prolific and enterprising family. The fourth Earl of Rothes was father of the notorious Norman Leslie who gave Cardinal Beaton his death stroke.

its neighborhood. Before the Reformation there was in the village of Monymusk a priory of Augustinian monks who were expelled in the second half of the sixteenth century. In 1587 the Forbes got possession of it and turned it into a manor house. It belonged to this family up to 1710, when it passed to the Grants. Father Frédégand is inclined to think that George Leslie frequented this manor, as his stepfather was connected with the Forbes, and the description Rinuccini gives of it is so exact that he could only have got his information from one familiar with the place. George had two brothers, Francis and William, but whether they were the issue of his mother's first or second marriage is not determined. The precise date of George's birth is also unknown, but it was probably in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. He affirms himself that his mother, his stepfather, his brothers and his whole family were living in error or heresy. Beyond what Rinuccini relates, nothing is known of his youth and conversion. "We admit, then," says Father Frédégand, "until the contrary is proved, that his relatives, in the enjoyment of easy circumstances, sent him to Paris to pursue his studies. After opening his eyes to the Catholic faith, he repaired to Rome with the object of being received into the priesthood." In 1608, according to the manuscript registers, he was a student in the Scotch College at Rome, doubtless with the intention of devoting himself after his ordination to the conversion of his fellow-countrymen. During that year he became acquainted with Pére Ange de Joyeuse, the Capuchin, who had gone to Rome to take part in the general chapter of his order. This intercourse led to his conceiving a desire to put on the Franciscan habit. "It is not impossible," observes Father Frédégand, "that his having been born in heresy may have raised up obstacles, although we do not see clearly why the minister-general should have been more difficult to accede than the rector of the Scotch College. However it may have been, we again lose trace of him for ten years, from 1608 to 1617. But he tells us himself that he completed his studies towards the latter date. On the other hand, he declares in a letter of the 11th of April, 1618, that he has worn 'the holy habit' for eleven years. We must then conclude that he entered the Order of Friars Minor Capuchin in 1608. It is very possible that he passed those years in the convents of Camerino and Urbino, as Rinuccini relates. But the latter erroneously affirms that at this epoch he applied himself with great success to preaching. This assertion is nullified by the evidence of Father Archangel himself, dated November 4, 1617: 'Having by this completed my course of studies, I am preparing to undergo the toils of a thankless ministry among my fellow-countrymen.'"

During his sojourn in the Capuchin convent at Bologna in the aforesaid year the sight of the wretched, neglected condition of British Catholics, fleeing from persecution at home, who had sought refuge in Italy, urged him to take an interest in their fate. With that object he approached Cardinal Maffeo Barberini protector of the Scotch Catholics, whom it is likely he had known when at college in Rome. "A multitude of Scotch, English and Irish Catholics, banished from their country by royal edict," he wrote to His Eminence in November, "are wandering through these countries like a flock without a shepherd. The unhappy people find no confessors who understand their language; the harvest is abundant and laborers are wanting. Only those, few in number, who go to Rome or Loreto can approach the tribunal of penance. The Congregation of Catechumens in Bologna has confided to me for instruction in our holy faith an Englishman brought up in heresy. As it is necessary to administer to him the sacrament of penance, charity for our poor people moves me to ask you to obtain for me permission to absolve him from all his sins, reserved cases and censures. I beg you to procure for me the same powers for all English subjects who shall present themselves."[11]

The Cardinal promptly procured from Paul V. the necessary faculties, for which Father Archangel wrote thanking him on January 24, 1618, taking occasion to petition for another favor, that of attaching some ordinary indulgences (already conceded) to a certain number of medals, crosses and pictures destined for his converts. Moreover, he begged his protector to extend the indulgences, granted at the request of Father Laurence, of Brindisi, to those who prayed for the conversion of German heretics, to English, Scotch and Irish who should ask from Heaven the same grace for their fellow-countrymen. The good prelate again approached the Pope, supporting the zealous Capuchin's petition. Paul V. accorded the indulgence of St. Charles. Having written on March 23, 1618, thanking the Cardinal-protector, Father Archangel again had recourse to his good offices. Large numbers of English soldiers had arrived in Bologna from Venice; they were well disposed and would

[11] Vatican Library, fonds Barberini latin 8,618, f. 123. A remark precedes this first letter: "Est Georgious Leslaeus ut patet ex catalago sacerdotum qui prodierunt ex Collegio Scotorum in Urbe." Here is the last phrase of this letter: "Lo fra tanto m'accingo à maggior fatícha in quella horrida vigna della mia patria, havendo hormai compito il corso de' miei studii." All the letters are signed: "F. Archango Scozzese Capuc. Ind." Father Archangel used two seals. One is indecipherable; the other is composed of a simple cross, barred with a lance and a handle surmounted by a sponge; a small reproduction of the penitential cross borne from time immemorial in procession by the Friars Minor Capuchins. (Note by Father Fredegand.)

willingly listen to Catholic preachers. The question was, Where were they to be brought together? The prior of the Congregation of Catechumens, Henry Urti, would willingly have given them access to their place of meeting, but other members of the council were opposed to it on the pretext that it was reserved for Jew converts. When the Capuchin waited on him with a letter of recommendation from the Cardinal, the prior promised to espouse his cause. The letter in which Father Archangel conveyed the good news to His Eminence, dated from Bologna on April 11, 1618, Father Frédégand says wonderfully portrays the frank character of the writer, as well as the difficulties of all kinds that obstructed his particular mission. "My faculty of absolving English, Irish and Scotch converts from heresy," he declares without any circumlocution, "is of no service to me; it is nullified by the clause stipulating that I can use it every time that they refuse to go before the Holy Office. But those who are returning to the Catholic faith are so well disposed that they never refuse to fulfill this formality. From the moment the Father Inquisitor has reconciled them *in foro externo,* I can no longer make use of my powers. Some go to seek absolution of the Santa Casa; others go to France; other again, discouraged and wearied, leave us without giving any edification. One has remained, waiting until I could hear his confession. It is then necessary to amend my faculty, and, moreover, to introduce another modification, imposed by the fact that our order forbids confessions of seculars. My apostolate among English heretics seems to be looked upon with suspicion by certain of my superiors; they find in it things to be taken count of or left alone. My intercourse with the laity, and above all with persons who have come from a country infected by error, appear to them calculated to scandalize simple and weak brethren. But these scruples are baseless, because my manner of life and morals is known to the whole province. Thank God, during these eleven years that I, though unworthy, have worn the holy habit I have been everywhere. 'Christi bonus odor.' But it is only a trial, designed either to temper my patience or to hinder the conversion and salvation of many erring ones. To solve this problem, then, it is of the utmost necessity that the Holy See should rectify my faculty as I indicate in the postscript. But this rectification ought to be put forward as spontaneous and inspired by the solicitude with which the Church is animated towards erring souls. It is to be desired that my new powers should be addressed to the Father Inquisitors of Bologna with directions to read it or for me to place it before my brethren. In this way I can devote myself in peace to the spiritual well-being of these poor abandoned ones, fortified by the good graces of my superiors and to the entire edification

of simple brethren." In the appendix or postscript he shows precisely how his faculty ought to be amended. He asked for the power of absolving from the sin of heresy *in foro interno* every Scotch, English or Irish convert, whether he refused or consented to present himself before the Holy Office, and also begged the Pope to grant him permission to interest himself in both the material and spiritual interests of the converts in the convent as well as outside of it.[12]

A short time afterward Father Archangel left Bologna. In the beginning of June he was on Monte Vernia, that sacred summit, the Mount Sinai of Franciscan history, where the Seraphic Patriarch received the stigmata. His next letter, dated from thence on June 3, was written with the intent of obtaining a favor for Father Angelus, an English Capuchin who, residing them in the province of Tuscany, wishes to visit Rome and Loreto and to communicate to the Cardinal-protector a vision and revelation he had had on the subject of the Pope and the conversion of England. A personal request by Father Angelus would have had very little chance of being acceded to, considering the large number of religious already in Rome in view of the chapter-general, and it was through the intermediary of his Scotch confrère he sought to prove the necessary obedience. Who, Father Frédégand asks in a footnote, was this Father Angelus, of England? He was neither Father Angelus, of London, nor Father Angelus, of Rasonio, he avers. Neither of these belonged to the Tuscan or Flemish provinces. The Necrologium Seraphicum Patrum et Fratrum Ord. Min. S. Francisci Capucinorum Antiquæ Provinciæ Flandro-Belgicæ (Tilbourg, 1897) mentions at p. 6 Father Angelus Turn, ex-guardian, professed in Italy, to which he returned, dying at Genoa on June 3, 1624. Would it be this latter, he suggests; but adds that Turn is perhaps an abbreviation of Turnholtanus; and then it would be a question of a Flemish Capuchin.

The next letter from Father Archangel to the Cardinal was from Pius. It brings on the scene the well-known Scotch historian, Thomas Dempster,[13] whom he calls "my cousin," being the son of Jane Leslie, sister of the laird of Balquhain. "My cousin, Thomas Dempster," he writes, "begs you to obtain for me the Pope's permission to hear his wife's confession. I make this request of you,

[12] Letter sent from Bologna on Wednesday in Holy Week, April 11, 1618, f. 129 et seq.

[13] Son of Thomas Dempster, laird of Muieresk, Aberdeenshire, born about 1579. He died at Bologna on September 6, 1625. He was a zealous Catholic, a learned professor and a voluminous writer. He mentions Father Archangel in his "Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Scotiorum," praising him for his chastity, piety and eloquence.

although I am persuaded that you will have already procured for me all the desired faculties. I shall doubtless find them at Bologna, to which I have not yet returned. It will be the easier to comply with the aforesaid request, as Father General has deferred to the Pope the decision of the question whether the Capuchins should hear the confessions of seculars. My superiors and some simple and not well informed brothers, while praising my apostolate, condemn certain material methods to which I have recourse, such as to maintenance of neophytes undergoing instruction. The Chapter-General has established missions in the Congo, Poland, France and England. Why, then, hinder me from devoting myself, *observata semper disciplina religiosa,* to the conversion of the numerous English heretics scattered through Italy? But I suppose you will already have remedied my position. The ill fortune of my cousin, Thomas Dempster, also greatly grieves me. In England heretical Bishops and preachers treat him as a Papist. Banished from his country, deprived of his patrimony and his position as the King's historiographer, he seeks a refuge in Italy, where he is pursued as heterodox. If he is not a heretic in England and if he is not a Catholic in Italy, a middle term must be chosen; then he is an atheist. I am saddened to see envious tongues enjoy the same credit in Rome, to the great detriment of a most innocent gentleman, as heretical tongues in London. But God is a just Judge." In conclusion, Father Archangel begs the Cardinal to cause his cousin's orthodoxy and merits to be recognized by the Pope.

Father Frédégand discerns a note of bitterness and discouragement in this letter. "The unjust criticisms, the malevolent interpretations of certain confréres on the subject of his apostolate," he observes, "seem to have unnerved Father Archangel. On the other hand, he is indignant at seeing the grave accusations leveled against his relatives with an interested object; he is so moved that he forgets to add to his letter a note in which the Father General, Clement, of Noto, announces to him that the permission to hear the confessions of seculars will henceforward be granted directly to the friars by the pope[14]—an omission which he rectifies the next day (July 21, 1618).

More than a year elapses before any record of his movements is obtainable. He again writes to Cardinal Berberini from Bologna on October 3, 1619; not, he observes, to acquaint His Eminence of the steps taken for seven years by Thomas Dempster to obtain the professorship of humanities in the university at that city,[15] knowing

[14] On this subject the reader is referred to the work, "Prime Costituzioni dei Fratri Minori Cappuccini di S. Francesco, pp. 24-70. Rome, 1913.

[15] He was for seven years professor in Paris, in 1616 obtained a professorship in Pisa and afterwards at Bologna.

that his cousin had already informed him, but to recommend another cousin, George Augustin Connes[16] (sic), who is going to Rome to finish his studies in the Scotch College, hopeful that his goodness, modesty and intelligence will render him worthy of the Cardinal's protection. As for himself, he was preparting a treatise, *De dominio publico et temporali Summi Pontificis in toto orbe,* which he intended sending to His Eminence when finished.

This was the last letter written in Italy. For about four years, from October 3, 1619, to August 5, 1623, he is lost sight of. It would be as perilous as difficult, Father Frédégand says, to elaborate hypotheses about his occupations during this epoch. The imaginary information supplied by Rinuccini and Barrault does not suffice. "How," he asks, "are we to admit that Father Archangel was nominated in Rome preacher at the Court of Paris? One asks himself for what reason? Would he have perfected himself to that degree in the French language during his twelve years' sojourn in Italy? Father Cyprian, of Gamaches, a contemporary who had the entrèe of the Louvre, twice refers to Father Archangel in his celebrated *Memoires.*[17] He speaks of the ardor of his zeal and the subtleness of his intellect, but not of the office he would have filled at court; yet he was well acquainted with the foreign Capuchins who had distinguished themselves in Paris. It is not admissable," Father Frédégand frankly avows, "that the singular fact of a Scotch Capuchin named royal preacher at a court where he was unknown would have escaped him." Thomas Dempster and the *Laurus Leslaeana,* he notes, are equally silent on the subject, though an incident so creditable to the Leslie family deserved to be chronicled. Father Frédégand puts forward the following supposition as one that seems to him the most probable: In 1618, the year when the Father General, Clement, of Noto, instituted the mission of Great Britain, Father Archangel, somewhat disheartened by the contradictions his ministry in Italy met with, would have resolved to return to Scotland. It is not necessary to dwell upon the precise date when he might have carried out this project; perhaps its execution was retarded until 1622. On the 22d of June of that year Gregory XV. definitely established the Congregation of Propaganda by the bull *Inscrutabili.* It is very possible that Father Archangel solicited and then obtained from the Minister-General, through the intercession of Maffeo Barberini, permission to go to Scotland. Father Frèdègand is inclined to assume that he alludes to this in a

[16] This cousin later became a canon of the Lateran and from 1637 to 1641 was a Papal envoy to the Court at London.

[17] "Memoires de la Mission des Capucins de la Province pres la Reine d'Angleterre depuis l'année 1630 jusqu', à 1669; published by Father Apollinaris of Valence, pp. 13-320. Paris, 1881.

letter to Colonel Sempill on January 30, 1630, in which he says: "Formerly the Father General administered the missions; he allowed his religious to evangelize their own countries." A letter of August 5, 1623, records his arrival in London in company with the Spanish Ambassador, the Marquis de la Hinojosa, deputed to the Court of James I. to negotiate the marriage of Charles, Prince of Wales, with the sister of Philip III., King of Spain, having sailed from Calais about June 13, 1623. Father Archangel was probably attached to his suite as interpreter, although he makes no allusion to it in his letter. Father Frèdègand suggests that he may have accompanied him as chaplain. "I find myself in London in the house of the Ambassador Extraordinary of Spain," he wrote to Cardinal Barberini.[18] "I shall presently go to Scotland, where I shall be the guest of Lord Herries. As this nobleman is full of zeal, I hope, by the grace of God, to labor there efficaciously for the conversion of many souls. James Maxwell, a brother of this nobleman, resides in Rome, where he lives in straitened circumstances. The merits of his family and his personal qualities make him worthy of every favor; that is why I warmly commend him to Your Eminence, that you may deign to intervene with His Holiness to obtain for him a sufficient pension conformable to his rank. Your Eminence has excellent motives to support this request and the Holy See to take it into consideration. The house of Maxwell has been Catholic for more than five centuries. Latterly it has suffered and still suffers grave injuries on account of its constancy in the faith. I beg Your Eminence to see to the successful issue of this request, because this gentleman's manor affords a refuge to all ecclesiastics who frequent the neighborhood. His brother, the Baron, wishes to provide for my maintenance and that of my companion. The King and his council here have sworn to observe all the marriage articles,[19] but they are kept so secret by the King's formal order that I cannot give you fuller information. Thanks to the toleration, the number of Catholics is rapidly increasing in the Kingdom of England, but it appears to be diminishing in that of Scotland on account of the persecution, which is also as violent as ever.[20] To crown our mis-

[18] When this letter was written, August 5, 1623, Cardinal Barberini had become Pope under the title of Urban VIII.

[19] The articles of an edict or decree of toleration which would have been proclaimed on the occasion of the marriage of the Infanta with the Prince of Wales. But this marriage did not take place.

[20] Dr. P. Hume Brown in his "History of Scotland" (Vol. II., pp. 271-272) says: "Since James' removal to England the Scottish Roman Catholics had received no little share of his attention. Before the Union his policy had been to deal as tenderly with his Catholic fellow-subjects as his circumstances would permit. The Gunpowder Plot, however, gave another turn to his mind, and thenceforward, till near the close of his

fortunes, there is little hope of amelioration, for the Scotch Council has not taken an oath to observe the articles like that of England. When published, they will be applied to England, while they will be rejected in Scotland. May God, in His infinite goodness, aid us! I have sought the help of men and have not found it. Those who negotiated the marriage had either an insufficient knowledge of the state of Scotland or were little willing to apply a remedy. It is impossible to get at the King's dispositions either as regards the temporal or the spiritual, for the man's heart is deep. God give His Majesty His most holy grace, as Your Eminence desires and asks daily in your prayers."

Commenting on this letter, Father Frédégand says it disposes of Rinuccini's affirmations on the subject of the incognito journey to the family manor of Monymusk. In place of going directly to the Highlands, he went first with a companion to Lord Herries' manor, Carlaverock Castle, near Dumfries, from whence, being near the border, he could, in complete security, observe the persecuting movement before proceeding further. It is presumed that he remained there for about a year, availing of his sojourn to finish certain polemical treatises, such as *De potestate Romani Pontificis in Princeps seculares et in rebus fidei definiendis,* mainly directed against the famous oath imposed by James I. on Catholics, which declared to be impious and damnable the doctrine attributing to the Pope the right of deposing sovereigns. It also attacked the very basis of Anglicanism in defending the doctrinal magisterium of the Sovereign Pontiff.[21] However that may have been, it is cer-

---

reign, the most ardent Presbyterian had little to complain of his zeal for the suppression of Popery. . . . Now and for many years to come the terror of a Catholic reaction still haunted the minds of all Scottish Protestants. The number of Catholics in the country, it is to be remembered, was still very great. They abounded in the shires of Aberdeen, Dumfries and Kirkendbright, and such a town as Paisley was a 'nest of Papists.' Among Catholic nobles were Huntly, Errol, Hume, Herries and even Dunfermline, the Lord High Chancellor of Scotland. What further excited disquiet was the swarm of Jesuits and seminary priests who flitted through the country under the protection of Catholics of position and influence. . . . The Catholic nobles gave special trouble, as James could never make up his mind to treat them like common recusants and unbelievers."

[21] J. H. Sbaralea, "Supplementum et Castigatio ad Scriptores Trium Ordinum S. Francisci," ed. A. Nardecchia, t. 1, p. 100, DLXXI, Rome, 1908. Quoted by Father Frédégand, who remarks that the treatise, "De Vocatione sua," must be attributed to Father Archangel Forbes, and that it was Father Faustin, of Diest, not Father Francis, who wrote the life of Father Archangel Forbes, not Father Archangel Leslie. "Bibliotheca Scriptorum," ed. Bernard of Bologna, O. C., p. 28. This author, he notes, describes the curriculum vitae of Father Archangel according to Rinuccini and Barrault. He also cites a manuscript biography composed by Father Richard of Ireland. Th. Dempster, O. C., n. 825.

tain that Father Archangel was in Aberdeenshire in 1625, as proved by a list of priests and Catholic laity in the northeast of Scotland drawn up about this epoch. He is mentioned among the priests and seminarists "trafficking" in the Dioceses of Aberdeen and Murray. It also mentions his brother William.[22]

Upon his arrival in Scotland Father Archangel threw himself into the work of the apostolate with an earnestness and ardor alike characteristic of his Celtic temperament and his Capuchin spirit, for the Capuchins formed a *corps d'élite* in the vanguard of the Church's missionary army. He fortified and consoled the Catholics, who might be called upon at any moment to prove their fidelity to the ancient creed of Caledonia, even to the shedding of blood, and carried on a polemical campaign against the Calvinists. One of his pamphlets addressed to Protestants, "Where Was Your Church Before Luther?" drew from Andrew Logie, archdeacon of Aberdeen, a response bearing the quaint title, "Cum Cono Deo, Raine from the clouds upon a Choicke (choice?) Angel, or a returned answer to that common quæritur of our adversaries, 'Where was your Church before Luther?'" (Aberdeen, 1624.) A preface in the form of a dedicatory poem shows that its object was an attempt to refute Father Archangel, who states that he wrote other works, as, for instance, two treatises on vocations to the priesthood and on the motives which led a lady to embrace Protestantism; but it is not known whether they were all printed. In his letter on January 30, 1630, to Colonel Sempill he announced the approaching publication of his method of controversy with heretics.

This letter gives interesting details of his life, his ministry and his trials in Scotland.[23] Written to a relative, perfectly informed about the men and affairs of his country, Father Frédégand says it possesses a character of undeniable sincerity. Colonel Sempill resided in Spain, where he generously subsidized the Scotch colleges of Madrid and Valladolid, and besides assisted the missioners who braved the perils of the ministry in Scotland, many of them being maintained by him. Father Archangel thanks him for his solicitude and begs him to continue his allowance, so that he may be able to publish his works, which he counts upon getting printed at Venice. This recourse to a distant relation, observes Father Frédé-

[22] This list forms part of the collection of manuscripts formed by Mr. J. Balfour preserved in the lawyers' library at Edinburgh. It is headed: "The names of priests and traffecting seminaries in the Dyocesis of Aberdene and Murray. . . . Capucian Leslie, commonly called Archangel. . . . III. William Leslie, brother to Georg Leslie, the Capucian."

[23] It was deposited in the State archives, as well as a Spanish translation. There is another Spanish translation preserved in the Scotch College of Valladolid. The researches Father Frédégand caused to be made at Valladolid and Simancas to discover the original were unsuccessful.

gand, sufficiently proves that his own family was not living in opulence. It is true that they were living in heresy until he came among them, a convert and a priest. "God," he wrote to his benefactor, "has employed me as the instrument of the conversion of my father, mother, brothers and all my family; of Alexander Leslie, of Afford, his wife and his son; of Mr. Regower, aged eighty, and his sons; of Baron Aquhorties-Leslie and his wife; of the Laird of Kirkaldy and his wife, who made her first confession to Father Stephen, of the Company of Jesus; of the Lairds of Pitcaple and Cluny-Gordon. The latter's father conceived such a hatred of me that he wanted to kill me. I have brought back to the Catholic faith three highland families of Badenoch. I have converted the Laird of Brunthell-Hays, the standard-bearer of the advance guard commanded by the Earl of Errol at the battle of Glenilvart against the Earl of Argyle, as well as the Laird of Littlehill at Leith. At Angus I have converted the eldest son of Viscount Oliphant and one of his nephews, as well as two stepdaughters of the Baroness Monorgan. The latter died after an illness of eight days, comforted by the sacraments. At the village of Fowlis I brought about the return of two entire families to the Catholic religion. In the south of Scotland I converted the Viscountess Herries, the Baroness of Locharby and three gentlemen of the Maxwell family. At my greatest peril I led back to a most edifying life the Laird of Lochinvar, who died in my arms. In the west I converted a daughter and two sons of the Earl of Abercorn and some domestics; at Edinburgh, Baron Ridhall-Hamilton, as well as another gentleman and his wife. These latter, having retained doubts on the subject of the Holy Sacrifice, heard a voice which said to them, 'Arise, arise, arise, go to Mass!' I omit and infinte number of other persons. Thanks be to God, the source of all good, there is not a place in the whole Kingdom where I have not sown the seed of the faith."

Such an active missioner could not for long escape the poursuivants or priest-hunters. On December 2, 1628, the Scotch Privy Council, assembled at Holyrood, ordered the Marquis of Huntly to arrest "the Capuchin Leslie, commonly called Archangel."[24] On

[24] "The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland," edited by P. Hume Brown, Second Series, Vo. II., p. 497 et seq; Edinburgh, 1900. At the same time as Father Archangel they ordered the arrest of four other priests named Leslie, one of whom, John Leslie, was a Jesuit, like Father Christie and many others. (*Ibid.* Vol. III., p. 31 et seq., p. 102 et seq., p. 408, Edinburgh, 1901; Vol. IV., pp. 99-103, Edinburgh, 1902.) These registers give much information about the pursuits of many Catholic Leslies and other important Scotch families, like the Herries, Lindsays, etc. Father Epiphanius Lindsay, a Capuchin, had also to endure persecution from 1629 to 1630. (Vede. Cyprian of Gamaches, O. C., p. 347 et seq.)

the same day one of his brothers, Francis Leslie, was summoned to appear before the Council for having published libels against the Established Church and State. But the courageous missioner, undeterred, continued to secretly exercise his ministry. On the 14th of March, 1629, a number of Catholics were accused of having assisted at Mass.

On the 3d of February and 14th of March of the same year the summons issued against his brother Francis was repeated. On the 12th of January, 1630, the Privy Council took the same measure against "Mr. William Leslie, called the Capuchin;" on the 23d of December, against Magdalen Wood, wife of John Leslie, of Kincragie, accused of "Papism;" on the 10th of November, 1631, against "Alexander Leslie, of Elrick, called the Capuchin for violent behavior and carrying firearms." Father Frédégand thinks this refers to three members of Father Archangel's family, perhaps his mother and two other brothers; the surname of "Capuchin" applied to them seeming to indicate the close relations that existed between him and them.

"These persecutions," observes Father Frédégand, "were a striking tribute paid to his apostolate. Far from depressing, they stimulated him to new conquests. But a trial of another kind awaited him. It was the more painful to him, as it came from a quarter he would have least expected from certain of his brethren in the priesthood. There was disunion among the priests on the mission in Scotland, especially among members of the different religious orders. A misplaced zeal, perhaps inspired by envy, completely put an end to the salutary work of Father Archangel. At the close of 1629 or in the beginning of 1630 he received an order to repair to Rome. The Congregation of Propaganda had been the recipient of a charge made against him, and it called upon him to justify himself. To reproduce the accusation launched against him we have only at our disposal implications and insinuations. In the letter from Father Christie to Father Gordon we read: 'He (Father Archangel) was no doubt full of zeal; but as to the rest, I shall say nothing.' In his letter to Colonel Sempill, Father Archangel contents himself with saying that they accuse him of sordid things and of levity. He indicates, besides, another motive for his journey to Rome—the changes applied to the Capuchin mission in Great Britain:

"Two reasons," he wrote, "oblige me to go to Italy: the first is the remodeling of the administration of our missions. This administration was formerly entrusted to the Minister-General of the order; he sent each religious to exercise the sacred ministry in his native country. But, thanks to the influence of Cardinal Richelieu,

a French father named Joseph[25] has obtained from the Pope the direction of all the missions of our order in the East as well as in the West. Before this father became administrator, the order counted twelve missions in Turkey and Persia, governed by a learned and active man called Father Pacificus (of Provins). But as soon as Father Joseph was administrator of France he recalled Father Pacificus and removed all Italian and Spanish religious from the missions. The present superior, a Frenchman (Father Leonard, of Paris), admits none but Frenchmen in the missions of East and West; therefore also in England and Scotland. The second reason arises out of the calumnies from which I have to justify myself before the Sacred Congregation de Propagation Fide. All the Catholic ladies and gentlemen who have escaped from persecution by flight and who have arrived in these quarters can give evidence in my favor. In none of the numerous conversions God has wrought through me is found any trace of the sordid things of which I am accused." After enumerating the principal conversions, he proceeds: "There is an abridged list of my converts in Scotland; they are all well known to my friends. But now who are the calumniators? Perhaps they are heretics? No, for they do not frequent the court of Rome. Are they Catholics? No, for none can say he has seen in me any signs of frivolity. Are they priests? Yes, I say, they are priests. But let them explain and distinctly state their accusations. Let them display the results of their ministry and we shall see if they are comparable to mine. But enough of such a disagreeable affair." He passes from the consideration of his own trials to those of the unfortunate Scotch Catholics wandering in a foreign land. "As to the persecution in Scotland," he continues, "it is increasing from day to day to the great detriment of the faith. The arrival in France, where Christian charity seems dead, of numerous Catholics driven from their country is a very painful spectacle. Every one makes a jest of their wretchedness instead of succoring them. There is at present in Paris a Baroness, widow of Baron Crilton Maxwell. She has been exiled after a long imprisonment. Her daughters, graceful young ladies, excommunicated by their Protestant ministers, have married in Scotland. Although the Queen of England has recommended the Baroness to the Queen Mother, nothing has been done for her; one would say that charity is banished from the Court of France. That is why I recommend her to Your Excellency. She is a noble lady, virtuous and learned. There is also a Scotch gentleman, George Mortimer,

[25] Père Joseph du Tremblay, the secretary and confidant of the great churchman and statesman. From the influence he possessed by reason of his position he was popularly known as "His Grey Eminence."

a very honorable man, devoted to God and his country. He has furnished me with the means for publishing my narrative. May I beg Your Excellency to regard this help as a title of recommendation? I have written this letter to Your Excellency in a plain, unadorned style, knowing that I am addressing the common Father of all." He concludes this long letter with the words: "Begging the Lord to multiply your days, I call myself Your Excellency's much obliged servant and poor relation, Father Archangel Leslie, Capuchin."

It is assumed that this letter was written in France when he was on his way to Rome. Pending his appearance before the Sacred Congregation, he devoted himself to ministering to the plague-stricken in Cremona. The result of the judicial inquiry, which ended in the spring of 1631, was his complete exculpation. The judgment pronounced by the Congregation on April 12, 1631, was a tribute of praise to his apostolate in Scotland, the evidence sent to Rome by Father Leonard, of Paris, and numerous Scotch Catholics for his justification proving to demonstration that he was a man of exemplary life, who had achieved brilliant results by his pen in his controversies with Protestants, and that he had done more to refute their errors than all the other missioners put together. On that account his Catholic fellow-countrymen entreated to have him sent back. Edified by such favorable reports, the Sacred Congregation referred to the Father Vicar-General the question of his recall to Scotland.[26]

"It is not known for what reason his departure was delayed," observes Father Frédégand. "Perhaps it was deemed inopportune and dangerous on account of the persecution, which was still vigorous and violent in 1631. Awaiting a favorable opportunity, Father Archangel was sent to the Province of the Marches of Ancona, where he had made his novitiate. To prove their high esteem of

---

[26] Bullarium Ordinis FF. Min. S. P. Francisci Capucinorum, ed. Michel de Zug, O. M. Cap., Vol. VII., p. 331, Rome, 1752. "Decretum Sac Congregationis de Propaganda Fide habitae, die 12 Aprilis, 1631. Referente Reverendissimo Dom. Tornielli litteras P. Leonardi Parisiensis Capucini, Praefecti Missionis Orientis et Angliae, attestationesque ab eo missas pro justificatione P. Archangeli Missionarii in Scotiam, et simul alias attestationes diversorum Catholicorum Scotiae, qui non solum testimonium perhibent luculentissimum devita exemplari dicti P. Archangeli, ac de illius diligentiis ac studiis in confutandis haereticorum deliriis per libros publice editos, iisque convertendis, ita ut ipse solus plus apud ipsos profecerit, quam coeteri Religiosi Missionarii, sed etiam magna instantia petunt, ut dictus Pater ad suam remittatur Missionem in Scotiam. Sacra Congregatio auditis justificationibus ae attestationibus praefatis censuit remittendum esse hujusmodi negotium Reverendissimo P. Vicario Generali Capucinorum, ut visis justificationibus ac attestationibus praedictis circa praefati Patris remissionem in Scotia pro suo arbitrio decernat."

him, his superiors nominated him guardian of the convent of Monte Giorgio, in the Diocese of Fermo. His relations with Rinuccini, who supplies these details, date from this epoch. His sojourn in Italy lasted about four years. It is probable that he devoted himself during that time to the Scotch Catholics scattered throughout the country. Perhaps, too, he was not unaware of the request presented by Cardinal Antonio Barberini to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda in the name of the Capuchin missioners in Scotland. He asked for powers to consecrate chalices and patens; to wear secular attire, even when traveling; to have a servant and a horse; to have and to use money in case of necessity. The Sacred Congregation, on January 30, 1634, expressed itself in favor of all these requests except the first.

Endowed with the desired faculties, Father Archangel returned to Scotland. We have no information about his movements during his second mission in his native country except what is contained in Father Christie's letters to Father Gordon. "To relieve him in his poverty," he writes, "I sent him before his death[27] ten Jacobus on behalf of the Marquis of Huntly. He died in his mother's poor house, situated on the banks of the River Dee, near Aboyne mill. He was buried in a ruined church between the mill and Kanakyle or Hunthall." "These few lines of Father Christie's," adds Father Frédégand, "are worth a whole funeral oration. Not a word of praise or regret for the courageous missioner; nothing but the cold statement of his poverty in life and in death. The grandeur of such an ending may escape the notice of the Marquis' chaplain; it remains, none the less, Father's Archangel's grandest title to glory as a Franciscan and a missioner. He who had given up everything in his youth to devote himself wherever he went to the conversion and moral and material solace of his unfortunate fellow-countrymen could only die stripped of everything. This denudation is the supreme proof of his supernatural abnegation and his love of souls."

Father Frédégand concludes his critical essay with an hypothesis concerning the origin of the biography of Father Archangel by Rinuccini. He assumes that during his sojourn at Monte Giorgio the Capuchin friar would have related not only his own and his family's trials, but also those of several of his English and Scotch brethren. Two sons of Baron Forbes and Margaret Gordon were Capuchins in the Flemish Province under the name of Archangel. The efforts of their Protestant father to keep them in heresy, the

[27] It is generally admitted that Father Archangel died in 1637. Father Bernard of Bologna records that a Jesuit named Andrew attended him in his last moments.

sufferings endured by their Catholic mother to rescue them from error, their conversion, the simulated marriage of one of them, their life in the Low Countries, were without any doubt known to Father Archangel Leslie. He would, none the less, have been not unaware of the interesting details of the apostolate of Fathers Angelus, of Raconis; John Chrysostom, of Scotland; Epiphanius Lindsay, Angelus, of London; Archangel, of Pembroke, and others. His Italian brethren and the Archbishop of Fermo would have heard with delight the recital of the dramatic incidents in their family occasioned by their conversion, of their controversies with Protestants, of the snares and perils encountered day and night by these apostles. The attribution, succession and localization of the events would have got mixed up in their minds after Father Archangel's departure, and after the lapse of some years names and dates were effaced from their memories. As to facts, their southern imagination embellished them *con amore* and enriched them with commentaries as fantastic and romantic. Thanks to their ignorance of the social organization and politico-religious situation of Scotland, thanks also to the similarity of names, Father Archangel Leslie became the only hero of the Capuchin apostolate in his country. Rinuccini's biography was the first result of this confusion of names and events. To give it credibility, its author declared that he scrupulously recorded the words of Father Archangel. If this declaration was true, Father Archangel was only a vain boaster; whereas his letters exhibit him in a different light. Between the latter and Rinuccini's testimony no hesitation is possible. Without knowing it, Father Archangel has drawn his own portrait. It is that of a man animated by the spirit of sacrifice, frank and loyal, whose apostolic zeal no trial can relax. The hero of the melodrama created by Rinuccini and Barrault, and copied by their numerous imitators, has no resemblance to this fine figure except in its framework. It is to him belongs the place too long occupied by his counterfeit.

Father Frédégand has rendered a distinct service to his order and to historical certitude by his careful and conscientious study of such an interesting personality as the Scotch Capuchin.

R.

THE WAR AND THE HOME RULE BILL.

THE unexpected is always happening; and though this a well-known law in the physical as well as the moral universe, no nation or individual has ever yet been able to anticipate and provide against all the possibilities of that law. As no human being can anticipate or provide against the situations which a person of capricious mind, whether man or woman, child or nonogenarian, may create in the relations of a family or a community, so in the realm of politics no one can foresee around the corner, so to speak, or surmise what lies hidden behind the curtain when night has descended on one day's doings and the coming of the next is awaited without apprehension or suspicion that it may be ushered in with a startling transformation over all things mundane. Not a speck of war-cloud lay on the horizon when the sun went down on the 4th of August last, but when the morning newspapers were looked at, to the amazement of all readers they brought the awful tidings that war that threatened to engulf all Europe had suddenly broken out on that continent. This unlooked-for calamity had a remarkable effect upon the fortunes of the Home Rule measure in Parliament. The independence of Belgium was attacked by the Emperor of Germany, who ordered an army to march into that little Kingdom in order to attack France, and England was bound by treaty to maintain the territorial integrity and political independence of Belgium at all hazards. This she determined to do, Parliament vigorously endorsing any action that the Government felt necessary to take on land and sea. The effect of these developments on the Irish measure at first seemed ominous, but the persistence of the Irish leader, aided by the fidelity of the men behind him, enabled the friends of the measure to regain confidence in its eventual triumph, even under conditions which made such a result apparently a forlorn hope. No time was lost by the lynx-eyed Unionists in snatching at so favorable a chance as this seemed to them, and endeavoring to utilize it for the permanent defeat of the measure which to them seemed the most odious and detestable proposition that reactionary Toryism was ever asked to accept. In the House of Commons several intimations were made by Unionist speakers that they would propose that no further steps be taken in regard to the Home Rule measure until the war was ended; and in the House of Lords Lord Lansdowne, on the part of the Unionist nobility, made a formal motion to that effect. At a later date Mr. Arthur J. Balfour, ex-leader of the opposition, made an attack upon the course of the Government in persisting with the Home Rule

and Welsh Disestablishment Bills so embittered in its terms that it was condemned in some of the Tory organs next day as unpatriotic in view of the fact that the outbreak of war had thrown responsibilities on the Ministry so onerous and difficult that unity of all parties was absolutely essential to the preservation of the Empire. When announcing the adjournment of Parliament until the 25th of August, Mr. Asquith intimated that he had no intention whatever of acceding to the suggestion that the Home Rule Bill be dropped. At the same time the arguments advanced by the Tory leaders in favor of a postponement of the measure had such force behind them in the shape of public opinion, as voiced in the press, that he was for a time on the horns of a dilemma how to act. There was the imminent danger of a revolt in the Irish Nationalist camp were he to yield to the Tories' objections to the pressing of the Home Rule measure at a time when the Empire was at war. On the other hand, he had pledged himself to the placing of the measure on the statute book before the prorogation. Were he to fail to keep his word, the effect would be disastrous, we know full well. Hence he had to choose a middle course, even though it was a clumsy and unprecedented one in parliamentary procedure. To request the sovereign to sign a bill while a bill to amend some of its provisions was in abeyance in the House of Lords was the novel course upon which he had to fall back. Desperate diseases need heroic measures to check them. What is true of the human system is true also of the body politic.

It was never expected by the most sanguine proponents of Home Rule that a satisfactory measure—that is, a measure that would work out the principle of justice as between the Irish people and the British Government could be drafted. When Mr. Gladstone, the greatest of Liberal statesmen, had to confess that the wit of man was powerless in regard to a settlement of the difficulty over the question of the proportion of Irish members that should be retained in Westminster to watch over Irish interests there, it may be well imagined how formidable that particular point was to his mind. Mr. Asquith's measure has settled it. The scheme passed over another difficulty that Grattan's one had to solve. This was the status of the Irish House of Lords. In Mr. Asquith's measure there is no Irish House of Lords to be provided for. Its place is taken by a Senate—partly nominative, partly elective, after the first installation. The act gives a constitution much superior to Grattan's Parliament, in that it is thoroughly representative and democratic, and provides Ireland with the means of thoroughly developing her own resources upon native lines, free from outside interference, whilst it secures to her a full share of influence in the

affairs of the Empire, to the greatness of which she has contributed more than her share.

The Home Rule Act should be accompanied by a Suspensory Act, deferring its coming into operation for a period of one year. This is not of consequence because, by the terms of the Home Rule Act itself, the assembling of the Irish Parliament might have been postponed for fifteen months. As the matter now stands, the act may come into operation any time from one to fifteen months after the suspensory period. Ireland cannot lose much by the suspension period, because it will afford time and opportunity for further consideration of a basis of agreement.

It was not until after a bitter and most extraordinary struggle against the Unionist opposition that Mr. Redmond succeeded in getting the Bill, which they had fought step by step, by foul means as well as fair, put on the statute book. The most shallow pretexts for the postponement of the measure were boldly advanced by the spokesmen of the Unionists, for their resort to Fabian tactics. Despite the fact that the measure under debate had been twice passed by large majorities in the House of Commons, both Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Arthur Balfour persisted in describing the bringing of it up for final decision "as introducing controversial matter"—a trick so palpably puerile as to be unworthy of a serious deliberative assembly like the House of Commons.

There are captious critics here, on this side of the ocean, who in the effort to belittle the work of the Irish Parliamentary party and the United Irish League to prepare the way for Home Rule, keep carefully out of sight the many important tasks they undertook and carried to a triumphant success. The first in value of these, as an educational factor, was the Local Government Act; the next as a measure on which to build up the edifice of material prosperity, without which the gaining of Home Rule would have been something in the nature of an empty concession, the scheme of Land Purchase. This was a gigantic problem, in its inception and in the elaboration of its details and the machinery for carrying it into practical effect. In addition to these two supreme needs of a transfer of power from an autocratic class to popular representative hands, there was the wide extension of the Laborers' Cottages Act, which was passed a quarter of a century before, but had, by reason of unwillingness of landlords on the one hand and of taxpayers on the other, to incur any responsibility for the amelioration of a large class who had the most crying claim for relief, been allowed to languish almost into desuetude. They were tersely described, as the beginning of the movement for their material betterment, as a class the worst housed, the worst fed and the worst paid in all Europe—

and personal observation made at the time over a very large estate in the south of Ireland and other smaller ones in various places, brought to the writer conviction that while there were others that proved the exception, those gone over proved the truth of the generalization. No pen could describe the miseries of the poor families who were huddled into the huts and shielings which, as if in satire, were termed "cottages," on the big estates of landlords some of whom had claims to nobility of birth at least, few to those of nobility of heart. But a pleasing change has been wrought since that time. A vast number of substantial and decent cottages have been erected in the southern and western counties; in the northern ones the progress has not been so marked, as appeared from recent reports in the provincial press. The improvement in the position of the agricultural laborers could not have been effected in so short a time as it had been were it not for the enactment of the Land Purchase Act and the establishment of the Congested Districts Board—a precursor measure, with compulsory powers to acquire land in cases wherein recalcitrant landowners, deaf to the appeals of reason and humanity, refused to meet the friends of progress and civilization half way—men like the Hon. Smith Barry and Lord Clanricade who never recognized the axiom of common sense and common justice that "property has its duties as well as its rights." While the Local Government Act was, by its systematic and tranquil operation, educating the farmers and the urban population in the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, so as to fit the country for the assumption of the public burden of Home Rule, the transfer of the soil of the country was being generally going on, by the system of Land Purchase, so that when the first Parliament opens in Dublin nearly three-fourths of the land will be in the possession, by legitimate bargain and without the shedding of one ounce of blood, of the former tillers or their descendants.

It has now been revealed that one of the reasons which helped the resistance of the Ulsterists (those who followed Sir. E. Carson and Mr. Bonar Law) to the enactment of Home Rule was help from Germany. How much money came from the Kaiser's agents to equip the forces of Orangemen to fight the Nationalist forces, if not the King's army, has not as yet been disclosed, but it has been roughly estimated at twenty-five million dollars. It was openly declared by Sir E. Carson (before war had been declared) that "Ulster" would rather owe allegiance to the Emperor of Germany than to an Irish Parliament. It was rather an awkward position, after that declaration, to find that loyalty to Germany was incompatible with loyalty to the King of Great Britain and Emperor of India, and in order to clear himself of suspicion of the disloyalty

implied in his words, the honorable gentleman went over to Ireland and induced some hundreds of the Ulster Volunteers to leave for France for military service against the Kaiser's armies. It was a ludicrous anti-climax, but not altogether unsuitable, from a dramatic standpoint, to the long-drawn-out performance of the "Ulsterites" under a legal-military leadership.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

Book Reviews

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. Vol. L., June, 1914.

Twenty-five years of honorable, vigorous, useful life! A record to be proud of. Such is the record of the "Ecclesiastical Review." For twenty-five years it has been an honor to the Church and to the city of its birth; it has preached true Catholic doctrine without variation or diminution; it has commanded the respect of the world by the dignity and ability of its contributors, by the truths which it taught, and by the manner in which it taught them.

The "Review" has been vigorous, living a healthy, progressive life. It has been prompt, courageous and efficient, not waiting on the action of some one else, not defending truth in a half-hearted, timid manner, not stopping at the first resting-place and forgetting to go further, but rather leading, always fearlessly, and pushing each conviction to its logical conclusion.

It has been not merely academic, but eminently practical. Twenty-five years ago the learned founder and editor, Dr. Heuser, saw the need of such a magazine. The field was large, practically unoccupied, and with heroic self-sacrifice he took up the work. Not for his own glory; least of all for gain; but for the benefit of the clergy, the advancement of the Church and the honor of God. Such motives could not fail. He devoted himself to the work with no thought of self, and it has prospered, as only those works prosper which God blesses, and to which He gives the increment.

Therefore, it may be truthfully said that this is the Jubilee time of Dr. Heuser, as well as of the "Ecclesiastical Review." They are inseparable, and although he did his best to conceal himself, the

world has found him out and honors him for the magnificent work which he has done for the "Review," while it begs him to continue that work and beseeches Almighty God to give him strength and years to go on.

SCRIPTA PONTIFICII INSTITUTI BIBLICI: LE BERCEAU DE L'ISLAM. Ier Volume: Le Climat-les Bedouins. Par *Henri Lammens, S. J.* Romae: Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1914; pp. 394.

SCRIPTA PONTIFICII BIBLICI INSTITUTI: EL GENESIS. Precedido de una Introduccion al Pentateuco. Por *L. Murillo, S. J.*, Professor del Instituto Biblico. Con licencia Ecclesiastica. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma, 1914; pp. xxiv.-872.

IL LIBRO DEI PROVERBI DI SALOMONE. Studio critico sulle Aggiunte Greco-Alessandrine del Sac. *Giacomo Mezzacasa*, della Pia Societa Salesiana, Dottore in Theologiae S. Scrittura. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma, 1913; pp. xii.-204.

I MIRACOLI DEL SIGNORE NEL VANGELO spiegati esegeticamente praticamente da *Leopoldo Fonck, S. J.*, Rettore del Pontificio Instituto Biblico. Volume Primo: I Miracoli nella Natura. Traduzione di Luigi Rossi-Di-Lucca. Con approvazione dell' Autorita Ecclesiastica. (Christus, Lux Mundi, Parte IV., Volume I.) Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma, 1914; pp. xxviii.-644.

This group of books from the Biblical Institute shows very eloquently the magnificent work being done by that organization, and at the same time swells perceptibly the body of Catholic Biblical literature, which in recent years has been steadily growing and spreading the truth throughout the world. As the Catholic Church is the only authorized custodian and interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures, we must look to her alone in the last analysis for the truth concerning them. This does not mean that others may not study them and investigate them and bring to bear upon them all the knowledge which kindred sciences can muster for the interpretation of them, but it does mean that the Church must finally say what is the Scriptural value of all this research and what conclusion is to be drawn from it. This is the work which is being done by the Biblical Institute, and in the volumes before us we have striking illustrations of the value of their labors.

The first of the group is one of a series dealing with Mohammed and Islamism. This part is devoted to the climate of Arabia and to the Bedouins. It is made up of lectures given by the author in Rome

and as the University of Beyrout, in which he brings before his hearers and his readers all that is necessary to make the two phases of the subject stand out in the most vivid manner.

In Genesis Professor Murillo brings out in a studious way the real purpose of the institute. In the discussion of such questions as authorship and the days of creation he clearly shows that it is not the purpose of the members of the institute to ignore or brush aside the conclusions of exponents of the higher criticism, even though they be extremely speculative at times, but rather to duly consider them and submit them to the judgment of men who are not only expert as critics, but orthodox as theologians.

The volume treating of the miracles of Christ is the first of four on the same subject. The other three will treat successively of Palestine and its inhabitants in the time of Christ, the life of Christ, and His discourses and parables.

In the treatise on the Book of Proverbs we have a critical study of the text, Hebrew and Greek, including the codices and versions.

Taken together, these volumes make an imposing group, reflecting honor on the learning and faith of the authors, and giving promise of great victories for truth when the many issues that have been leading men astray so long in the field of Scriptural literature are put to the test.

ONTOLOGY, OR THE THEORY OF BEING. By *P. Coffey, Ph. D.*, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Maynooth College, Ireland. 8vo., pp. 439. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The present volume will receive a special welcome from those who know Dr. Coffey's excellent work on logic. These also will watch with greatest interest the appearance of the third volume which the author promises on the "The Theory of Knowledge." These three volumes will well supply that real want in our universities which the author has recognized of an English text-book on the subject from the scholastic standpoint. He says:

"It is hoped that the present volume will supply a want that is really felt by the students of philosophy in our universities—the

want of an English text-book on general metaphysics from the scholastic standpoint. It is the author's intention to supplement his Science of Logic and the present treatise on Ontology by a volume on the Theory of Knowledge. Hence no disquisitions on the latter subject will be found on these pages; the Moderate Realism of Aristotle and the Schoolmen is assumed throughout.

"In the domain of Ontology there are many scholastic theories and discussions which are commonly regarded by non-scholastic writers as possessing nowadays for the student of philosophy an interest that is merely historical. The mistaken notion is probably due to the fact that few, if any, serious attempts have yet been made to transpose these questions from their mediæval setting into the language and context of contemporary philosophy. Perhaps not a single one of these problems is really and in substance alien to present-day speculations. The author has endeavored, by his treatment of such characteristically "mediæval" discussions as those on Potentia and Actus, Essence and Existence, Individuation, the Theory of Distinctions, Substance and Accident, Nature and Person, Logical and Real Relations, Efficient and Final Causes, to show that the issues inolved are in every instance as fully and keenly debated —in an altered setting and a new terminology—by recent and living philosophers of every school of thought as they were by St. Thomas and his contemporaries in the golden age of mediæval scholasticism. And, as the purposes of a text-book demanded, attention has been devoted to stating the problems clearly, to showing the significance and bearings of discussions and solutions, rather than to detailed analyses of arguments. At the same time it is hoped that the treatment is sufficiently full to be helpful even to advanced students and to all who are interested in the "Metaphysics of the Schools." For the convenience of the reader the more advanced portions are printed in smaller type.

"The teaching of St. Thomas and the other great schoolmen of the Middle Ages forms the groundwork of the book. The corpus of doctrine is scarcely yet accessible outside its Latin sources. As typical of the fuller scholastic text-books the excellent treatise of the Spanish author, Urraburu, has been most frequently consulted. Much assistance has also been derived from Kleutgen's "Philosophie der Vorzeit," a monumental work which ought to have been long since translated into English. And finally, the excellent treatise in

the Louvain 'Cours de Philosophie,' by the present Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin, has been consulted with profit and largely followed in many places. The writer freely and gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to these and other authors quoted and referred to in the course of the present volume.

THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC REFUGEES ON THE CONTINENT, 1558-1795. Vol. I. The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries. By *Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph. D.*, Instructor in Church History, Catholic University of America. 8vo., pp. liv.-480.

Dr. Guilday is to be congratulated for having chosen so rich a subject for his maiden effort in the field of history. He begins by saying:

"There can be no complete history of that religious fervor among English Catholics of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which forced so many of them into exile on the Continent, and particularly into the Catholic low countries; no all-round and adequate judgment of the English Catholic *diaspora,* unless it be studied in its relation to the similar movement of French, Dutch and Walloon Protestant exiles during this same period. We have grown so accustomed to eulogies on the Huguenot exiles and condemnations of the lack of patriotism shown by English Catholics that any readjustment of our ideas on the question seems well-nigh hopeless. And yet historical justice demands new light on the aims and policy of the Catholic exiles. The meagre efforts that have been made up to the present on the part of historical students to vindicate these loyal exiles of pre-emancipation days and the lack of any synthetic literature on the subject have been lost sight of in the great mass of numerous and serious historical studies which have been written in English and in French to perpetuate the deeds and to vindicate the policy of the continental Protestant exiles in England.

"The object of this present work is to offer a humble contribution to the story of these English Catholic exiles. We must leave to others to do for them and their rightful place in English history what has already been done for the French and Flemish Protestant refugees in England, namely, to study in detail the destinies of these thousands of voluntary exiles who never hesitated for a mo-

ment to expatriate themselves for the sake of their religious belief, and whose energetic resolution can only inspire a strong sentiment of fellow-feeling in those who have the same faith as themselves, a profound respect in the minds of those who possess a different religion and both regret and sympathy in those who sincerely love their country. To do all this would be beyond the scope of the present volume. One point only has been taken up and developed—their activity in establishing schools and colleges, convents, monasteries and seminaries, where the Catholic ideal was kept bright in the minds of their sons and daughters, and where, hand-in-hand with a love for God and His Holy Church, went a love for their country and a loyalty to their sovereign which have never been equaled in similar circumstances since nation took its place apart from nation and men imbibed that affection for the land of their birth which no number of years spent in exile will ever obliterate or destroy. Surely it is a legitimate task to gather from the tangled skein of the records that have come down to us the story of their gallant defense of their faith."

The reader will agree with the author that it is not only a legitimate task, but also a most laudable one.

He will go further and say that it is also a difficult one. The equipment, zeal, patience, enthusiasm and humility that were required in the one who followed the manuscript and printed authorities on the subject through the libraries and museums of England, Spain, Belgium and Rome, and submitted the results of his labors to the best authorities before presenting them to the public, are rarely found in a young author engaged on his first serious work of magnitude. Dr. Guilday possesses them in a marked degree, and therefore his book is a valuable contribution to history. The second volume will be awaited with interest, and the author's future will be observed with sympathy.

MORE JOY. By the *Right Rev. Paul Wilhelm von Keppler*, Bishop of Battenburg. 12mo., pp. 257. St. Louis: B. Herder.

One dreary winter I wrote my "Little Book of Joy," and in the spring of 1909 I sent it forth as an Easter greeting. It met a kindly welcome here and abroad among both people of culture and those

commonly called the "lower classes." Wafted by a happy fate over land and sea, it encountered a larger number of friends than provision had been made for, and was introduced in more than one foreign land before it had yet learned the language of the country. Denominational barriers were lowered before it, and from the reviewers it obtained passports even into hostile camps. When, after a year of travel, it came home again to its author, it bore the proud title "Fiftieth Thousand" and had many a tale to tell. Well-filled mail-bags from both hemispheres followed it home, bringing touching testimonies of gratitude, moving confidences from pain-racked souls, messages of enthusiastic concurrence, of keen criticism, of encouragement, together with requests for "more."

Our Little Book found its starting point, and indeed its very reason of being, in the joylessness of modern civilization.

Now, the poisonous weed of pessimism is no Christian or Catholic growth; it flourishes in the world's own soil. As Father Weiss has noted, it is the unbeliever, not the Christian, who makes the bitterest, most pitiless criticisms of life:

"Schilling calls existence a farce, an absurd romance; Feuerbach, a madhouse, a jail; Schopenhauer, a sham, an annoying and useless interruption of the steady calm of eternal nothingness. Swinburne in "Atalanta" describes life as a time

> Filled with days we would not fain behold
> And nights we would not hear of.

And Moritz Block affirms that throughout human history evil keeps so much to the fore and good so far in the background that we can get statistics of evil conduct only, never of the good."

There is more optimism, a stronger affirmation of the value of life, in Catholic Christianity than in all the rest of the world.

And then the Right Reverend author proceeds to draw out this optimism. Beginning with a chapter on the Right to Joy, he treats successively of the Modern Destroyers of Joy, Joy and Youth, Joy and Christianity, Joy and Holiness, a Gallery of Joyful People and other striking phases of the question.

It is surely a pleasant subject, and one that should appeal to every one. There was never a time when it was more opportune, and the cultivation of the joyful spirit will make men better as well as happier.

INDEX TO THE WORKS OF JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Lovers and students of Newman, and their name is legion, will be very grateful for this index. Some authors can be studied disconnectedly with satisfaction and profit; Newman is not one of them. There is an individuality about him and a continuity of thought in him that calls for a general knowledge of his works if one would understand him on a particular subject. Hence the importance of this index.

The author says it is to be tried by these three questions: "Did Newman say this?" "Did he ever unsay it, and if so, where?" "Are there any notable sayings of his not brought into due prominence?"

This is not a Concordance, or Onomasticon; it is meant to be a guide to Newman's thought, to the changes of that thought, or, as he would have said, to the "development" which his thought ran through, from the first public utterances of the Fellow of Oriel to the last words of the aged Priest of the Oratory. In later life he republished sundry of his Anglican works, with notes not unfrequently opposed to the text. The chief retractations are indicated by a phrase familiar to readers of St. Thomas, *sed contra.*

To avoid cross-references the same saying is often entered under several headings.

THE PRIEST AND SOCIAL ACTION. By *Charles Plater, S. J.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The title and purpose of this book is thus explained in the preface:

"Charitable action, in the narrower sense of the term, seeks to relieve poverty, misery and sickness. Social action tries to prevent them as far as possible by removing their causes. Social action may have exactly the same high motive as Christian charity. There is no antagonism between the two; they supplement one another. Both form part of a parish priest's work, for both have an important bearing on the care of souls.

"Many priests in English-speaking countries as elsewhere are experts in charitable and social action. They have acquired that in-

sight into the real needs of society, and especially of the poor, which is peculiar to the clergy. But as they themselves are usually far too busy to write books, I have asked them to let me gather their experiences into a volume which might be useful to others."

The author covers a wide field, including Germany, France, Belgium, England, Ireland, the United States and Canada. It was no easy task to gather reliable information about Catholic social work in all these countries, and only one who is thoroughly interested in the subject and has kept in close touch with it could have had that knowledge of it and of sources of information concerning it which are necessary. The amount of social work done by Catholics will surprise those not familiar with it, and what has been accomplished will encourage many to join the movement.

A GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH. By *Professor A. T. Robertson, D. D.*, Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 8vo., pp. xl.-1,360. New York: George H. Doran Co.

The announcement says this great work by Professor Robertson has been undertaken and prosecuted in the spirit of devotion to a great cause.

Study and research and discovery have rendered all former Grammars of the Greek New Testament either incomplete or inadequate.

Professor Robertson gave the first expression to his study in a "Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament," issued in 1908, which in addition to having been translated and published in four foreign languages, Dutch, French, German and Italian, is now in its third edition in English.

The present "Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research" is designed for advanced students in theological schools, for teachers and professors, for earnest ministers and for libraries.

But perhaps the greatest value attaches to this work for the preacher and the thorough student of the New Testament..

A mere glance at the book will convince one of the truth of the author's statement that he first took up this work twenty-six years ago, and that for a dozen years it has been the chief task of his life.

It was a gigantic task, and in addition to the scholarship and tireless labor necessary for its accomplishment, it called for great courage to oercome the many obstacles that stood in the way.

We do not propose to enter into a critical review of the book, but rather to call attention to it, to record our admiration for the zeal of the author and to congratulate him on the completion of his work.

PRUDENS SEXDECIM LINGUARUM CONFESSARIUS etiam sine ulla scientia linguarum. Methodus Optica pro Confessione integra et Matrimonio confessario et poenitente mutuas linguas prorsus ignorantibus, a R. P. *Michaele d'Herbigny, S. J.* (iuvantibus multis ex omni gente confessariis). Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris, 1914; pp. viii.-102.

It certainly seems like promising too much to say that any confessor, without any knowledge of any language except his own and Latin, can hear the confessions of persons of sixteen different tongues without learning a word of the language which they speak. And yet that is exactly what this book promises to enable the confessor to do, and it does it. All that is required on the part of the penitent is that he be able to read his own language, and that he meet the confessor in a place where there is sufficient light to read. The necessary questions are arranged and numbered in the same order for each language in the book, and on a Latin folder for the use of the priest. As the penitent reads each question, he says yes or no with a motion of the head, and tells the number with his hands. The book can also be used for the marriages of foreigners in the same way.

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE CATECHISM. By *Dr. M. Gatterer, S. J., Dr. F. Krus, S. J.*, Professors of the University of Innsbruck. Translated from the Second German Edition by Rev. J. B. Culemans. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

In spite of the profusion of catechetical literature at the present time, or rather because of it, the authors of this book feel justified in sending it forth. So much interest has been taken in catechetics recently that books on the subject have multiplied rapidly. But this very profusion of matter may become confusing instead of

enlightening, if there is no order in it. As the authors truthfully say: "In the very profusion of hints and helps to make our teaching of Christian doctrine more efficient, we meet with truths overstated or misdirected, matters of detail variously taken, facts incompletely proved or applied, and rules inconsistently urged or discordantly interpreted. What we need at present is not intention or originality, nor sagacity, nor even learning—at least in the first place, though all gifts of God are in a measure needed and never can be unreasonable when used religiously; but we need particularly a sound judgment, patient thought, discrimination, a comprehensive mind, an abstinence from all private fancies and caprices and personal tastes—in a word, divine wisdom."

In this spirit the subject is treated, and the whole field is covered in such a way as to give a thorough review of the fundamental principles of the art and science of catechization.

The book will appeal to clergymen and teachers without exception, and it ought to help them very much in this work, the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated.

FRANCISCO PALON'S LIFE AND APOSTOLIC LABORS OF THE VENERABLE FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA, founder of the Franciscan Missions of California. With an Introduction and Notes by *George Wharton James.* English Translation by C. Scott Williams. 8vo., pp. 338. Pasadena: George Wharton James.

This book from the pen of a disciple of Father Junipero was originally published in Mexico in 1787. It is the first work dealing with the history of early California, and yet, with the exception of a few chapters, it has never been done into English before. This is strange when one considers its historical value, for the early history of California depends on it to a great extent. It is also remarkable because of its biographical value, for its subject was an apostolic man of heroic mould, who is acknowledged by all classes, irrespective of creed or nationality, as one worthy of the highest respect. The story of his work and adventures reads like a romance.

For those who have visited the old missions of California, hallowed by his footsteps, this book will have a special interest. It

is a valuable addition to the history of the Pacific Coast and Christian missions.

INITIATION. By *Robert Hugh Benson.* New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Sir Neville, a wealthy young Englishman, is initiated. He has inherited his estates from a father who died early because of a dissipated life. He lives with his Aunt Anna, the widow of his father's brother and her son Jim, a boy of about eight years. He is a Catholic by birth, with a resident chaplain on the estate. He becomes engaged to a Protestant young woman whom he meets with her mother traveling on the Continent. She jilts him. He is afflicted with a tumor on the brain, which causes intense suffering and blindness, and obtains relief temporarily through a surgical operation. The disease develops again and finally causes his death. Then Jim becomes Sir James. In the meantime, however, Sir Neville's faith had grown lukewarm, especially under the influence of his betrothed. When she left him he sought consolation in material things. When these failed and affliction rested heavily upon him, he had recourse to grace, and found strength.

This is a mere sketch of the story, but sufficient to indicate its serious purpose, though it does not show the sustained interest that runs through it, the variety of subordinate characters that pass across its pages, nor the many incidents of minor importance that fill up the lives of its people.

ORDO Divini Officii Recitandi Missaeque Celebrandae. Juxta Kalendarium. Ecclesiae universalis. Nuperrime reformatum et ad tramitem novarum rubricarum. Pro Anno Domini MCMXV. Paschate recurrente die 4 Aprilis, 240, 127 pages. Net, 50 cents. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

The New Ordo made in Rome for the Universal Church is a model of clearness and conciseness. The short, general directions in the beginning of the book, with the signs used throughout, obviate the necessity of profuse daily directions and make things much clearer. The introduction of a general Ordo, which supersedes all special Ordos, is also a feature that will make for uniformity and unity.

At the beginning of each month the number of days in the month is given, the day of the new moon and full moon is mentioned and a text from some Sunday or feast is quoted. The publishers are prepared to furnish the book at once, and many persons will be glad to have it so early in order to become familiar with it.

REALIA BIBLICA Geographica, Naturalia, Archeologica, quibus Compendium Introductionis Biblicae completur et illustratur. Auctore *Martino Hagen, S. J.* P. Lethielleux, Paris, 1914; pp. viii.-728.

Father Hagan furnishes us with the key to his new edition of P. Cornely's Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures in this volume which has recently come from the press. His previous "Lexicon Biblicum,," in three volumes, might have answered the purpose if it were not so large, but for the ordinary student it was prohibitive. This compact volume fits the situation exactly, for although elimination and condensation were necessary in the making, it would be a mistake to conclude that the book is therefore less complete or exact. Throughout its pages the learned author is the sure guide that may be followed with confidence.

PERIODICAL

70771

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE